DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 214 532 IR 010 119

TITLE Executive Review in ARL Libraries. SPEC Kit #72.
INSTITUTION Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C. Office of Management Studies.
PUB DATE Mar 81
NOTE 111p.; Best available copy.
AVAILABLE FROM SPEC, ARL Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20036 ($15.00, prepaid plus $2.00 handling charge per order).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Evaluation; Administrator Qualifications; College Libraries; Deans; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; National Surveys; *Personnel Policy; Questionnaires; Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS Association of Research Libraries; *Library Administrators

ABSTRACT

This package of procedures and forms for the review of academic library directors includes two background papers as well as evaluation materials used by 14 members of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL). These materials, which include both library-specific and university-wide reviews of administrative personnel and/or faculty, were provided by Arizona State University, Dartmouth College, Louisiana State University, the University of Miami, Notre Dame University, the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Rochester, State University of New York at Albany, Southern Illinois University, Texas A&M University, the University of Toronto, and Washington State University. Background information is provided by "Performance Evaluations of Library Directors," by Marion P. Munzer, and the "Summary and Conclusions from Presidential Assessment," from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. (RBF)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

March 1981

OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED214532

Executive Review

Kit 72

IR010119

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxine K. Sitts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

spec

March 1981 No. 72 OMS

Systems and Procedures Exchange Center

ISSN - 0160 - 3574

EXECUTIVE REVIEW IN ARL LIBRARIES

In the last decade, there has been a trend toward formalizing the evaluation process for executives in higher education including university and college presidents and other top administrators. One measure of the growing concern for periodic, official assesment of chief executive officers comes from the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, which notes that 20% of the boards reporting informal or no presidential assessments intend to develop formal procedures in the near future . In keeping with this interest, discussion at the May 1980 meeting of the Association of Research Libraries included an exchange among directors concerning the current practices of their institutions as well as an assessment of the potential value to them of improved review methods. The results of these discussions are the basis for this Flyer.

Because the library director is symbolically, if not actually, responsible for all that happens in or to the library, his or her performance is subject to critical assessment. The teaching faculty have one perspective, the library staff have other opinions, and, of course, university administrators have their judgements. These several viewpoints are regularly, although usually informally, exchanged in most institutions. However, formal, constructive review of the library director's performance is only beginning to emerge as an important element of accountability.

RATIONALE AND PURPOSES FOR EXECUTIVE REVIEW. When they are designed to be thoughtful and equitable, assessment techniques can make an important contribution to maintaining and developing the best talent in critical leadership positions within academic libraries. Clearly there are other closely-related factors such as the process and criteria used to select directors; the training and preparation of senior library managers; the skills, background, and styles that contribute to success in this position; and the type of support the library director gets from the institution. However, periodic, formal review is seen by a number of directors as a way to provide them with genuine help, to encourage them in what is being done well, and to strengthen what needs more attention. Such an emphasis on thoughtful feedback and on fair, calm assessment of performance is viewed as an attractive incentive to the library director concerned with professional growth and effectiveness within a particular institutional setting.

Whether it is formal or informal, the review process can be an educational tool as well as a protective device. The process may allow more precise definition of performance expectations on the part of the institution. It can give the director a chance to engage the interest of key individuals and groups in the problems and potentials of the library. It also can prevent unfair, unexpected, or capricious treatment of the individuals involved. After all, the pressures on a library director are extremely demanding. Declining resources have prompted increased attention to accountability and performance. A channel for focusing this attention on constructive areas is needed, and periodic review can provide such a channel.

While the value of formal assessment of executives is becoming more widely recognized, there are concerns regarding the productivity of reviews for library directors. Some reviews are conducted as routine exercises using standardized forms or inquiries

The Systems and Procedures Exchange Center (SPEC) is operated by the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Telephone (202) 232-8656.

inappropriate to the library situation, and these types of reviews are viewed as having little meaning or value. Many library directors affirm the worth of informal, ongoing evaluations as part of regular communications with peers and university administrators, while seeing the establishment of formalized evaluations as an indication of problems. Other directors state that their responsibilities and problems are unique within an institution, and that review tends to be unhelpful because university administrators conducting the review do not understand enough about the director's position.

The specific purposes of an evaluation greatly affect the methods used. If the review is a pro forma event, then an informal approach often is adopted that focuses on descriptive information in the range of activities and personal accomplishments of the director. In other instances, the library director is treated like other academic deans and is subjected to a documented investigation involving several constituencies. Such reviews tend to be closely related to the governance procedures of the institution.

There are also instances where the review is directed toward strengthening the director's position and improving his or her performance. On these occasions, the review process is invariably an interactive dialogue where the director is provided useful feedback on past performance and future expectations. Sometimes the review process is used to decide whether to retain or remove a library director. In these cases, efforts are aimed at investigating problems in the library from the viewpoint of the director's responsibilities. Other purposes for assessment include reviewing library goals, educating important groups to the role of the director, or determining the salary level of the director. Also cited by ARL directors as outcomes of reviews were advancement of the library's situation within the university, changes in the level of involvement of the library director in university policy-making groups, and the facilitation of implementation of major changes in university-wide programs or goals.

CRITERIA AND METHODS OF REVIEW. Although dependent upon the insititution's philosphy or rationale, and also influenced by the specific purposes for any individual review, some generalizations can be made about the criteria and methods of library directors' reviews. In most cases, ARL directors subject to formal reviews come from institutions that have established performance evaluation procedures for all major academic and administrative officers. Not unlike other chief executives, most directors report that their ability to communicate and articulate library needs, goals and programs to the institution and constituencies are basic criteria upon which they are evaluated. Within that same arena, their ability to communicate goals within the library itself also was frequently mentioned. Other common criteria include the ability to plan and organize the library, to manage budgeting and fund allocation, to manage personnel, and to raise funds.

While there is a growing movement toward more periodic reviews, most of the directors involved in discussion groups at last year's ARL meeting were not reviewed regularly. Out of a total group of about 35, eighteen characterized their reviews as informal, four as formal, and seven said they were not reviewed. Of those who mentioned time periods, eight specified five-year reviews, two noted two-year reviews and four said they were reviewed annually.

Committees of peers within the university are a frequent method of review for more formal procedures, and often these committees use inteviews and questionnaires to gather information from library staff, teaching faculty, the faculty senate, and various library-related committees. At least one institution asks other library directors who work with the director to comment. The next most mentioned method for review was by an immediate superior of the director, and often this was more informal than committee review. Finally, libraries that are part of large state systems tend to make use of standardized forms and criteria.

The accompanying kit on Executive Review (#72, March 1981) contains 14 examples of review procedures and forms and two background information documents (94 pages). It is available for $7.50 to ARL members and SPEC subscribers and $15.00 to all others -- prepaid only -- from the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, ARL/Office of Management Studies, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C., 20036. There is a $2.00 per order handling charge.

ISSN - 0160 - 3582

EXECUTIVE REVIEW

Kit #72
March 1981

Page

LIBRARY DOCUMENTS*

Faculty Senate Report on Annual Evaluations of Directors and Deans and Evaluation Form. Arizona State University. 1

Form Letter Regarding Review of Administrative Officers. Dartmouth College. 3

Operating Procedures for Performance Evaluation of Professional, Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel. Louisiana State University. 4

Faculty Manual Excerpts and Opinion Survey-Evaluation of Deans. University of Miami. 12

Procedures for Review of Director of Libraries and Discussions of Revisions of Procedures. Notre Dame University. 22

Administrator Evaluation Form. University of Oklahoma. 25

Annual Review of Academic Deans. Oklahoma State University. 26

Review of Academic Administrative Offices. Pennsylvania State University. 35

Procedures for Quinquennial Review. University of Rochester. 36

Evaluation of Academic Deans and Directors and Questionnaire and Criteria for Director of Libraries. State University of New York at Albany. 39

*Procedures and forms included in this kit are used for library director review: some are library-specific, while others are also used for faculty or administrators on a university-wide basis.

Page

Faculty Evaluation. Southern Illinois University. 48

Library Professional Data Sheets. Texas A&M University. 56

Policies for Librarians-Evaluation of Library Directors. University of Toronto. 59

Review of Academic Deans and Directors of Libraries-Procedures. Washington State University. 63

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Performance Evaluations of Library Directors. Marion P. Munzer, State University of New York at Albany. 66

Summary and Conclusions from Presidential Assessment. Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. 90

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

(This is the report of the chairperson of the Faculty Senate who was asked by the Senate Executive Committee to make a decision as to the intent and implementation procedures implied and stated in the several resolutions passed by the Senate relative to the annual evaluation of the chairpersons/directors and deans.)

Each faculty member should have an opportunity annually to evaluate his/her department chairperson/division director and dean. This evaluation is confidential and may not require the signature of the evaluator.

The development of appropriate evaluation forms is the responsibility of:

1) the department/division senior senator (in the evaluation of a chairperson/director), and
2) the college senator (in the evaluation of the dean).

Following the completion of the evaluation, where the forms are returned to the appropriate senator, the forms are transmitted directly:

1) to the appropriate dean (in the evaluation of chairpersons/directors), and
2) to the academic vice president (in the evaluation of a dean).

In no instance are the evaluation forms to be available to the evaluated party except as summarized by the supervising administrator nor are they to be transmitted through the evaluated party.

At the discretion of the department/division senators or the college senator, the person being evaluated may be involved in the development of the evaluation instrument.

The result of the evaluation should be improved administrative philosophy and procedures. Forms being utilized should assist the supervising administrator in reinforcing desireable and effective attitudes and activities as well as identifying weaknesses and potential problem areas.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Evaluation, University Librarian

KEY: 5 - Excellent
4 - Very good
3 - Good
2 - Fair
1 - Poor
Un - Unable to evaluate

A. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION

	Ratings
1. Maintains clearly defined and realistic goals and objectives for the library as a part of the university community.	1.
2. Is concerned with providing optimum library service for	2.
a. students	a.
b. faculty	b.
c. the community	c.
3. Establishes clearcut lines of responsibility and authority.	3.
4. Supports decisions and professional actions of individual members of the staff.	4.
5. Gives reasons for directives and tries to see that they're understood.	5.
6. Works closely with department heads and is familiar with the goals and operations of each department.	6.
7. Adjudicates with impartiality and understanding the conflicts that arise between departments.	7.
8. Utilizes input from departments involved when making policy decisions.	8.
9. Maintains an "open-door" policy for discussion of problems.	9.
10. Maintains effective communication with	10.
a. Supervisors	a.
b. Library Faculty	b.
c. Classified staff	c.
d. University faculty	d.
e. Student body	e.

B. PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT

1. Creates a climate wherein each staff member feels that his job is important.	1.
2. Encourages initiative.	2.
3. Encourages professional growth.	3.
4. Accurately assesses and effectively utilizes the abilities of subordinates.	4.
5. Successfully maintains high morale among	5.
a. Classified Staff	a.
b. Library Faculty	b.
c. Supervisors.	c.

C. PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES

1. Considers the many sides of a problem before arriving at a workable solution - - is thorough.	1.
2. Makes decisions based on available facts with reasonable speed.	2.
3. Is innovative; continually seeks new and improved methods.	3.
4. Has a sense of humor.	4.
5. Inspires confidence.	5.
6. Takes full responsibility for his actions without trying to "pass the buck".	6.
7. Is approachable.	7.
8. Does not allow personal bias to influence his judgement.	8.
9. Makes library employees aware of his presense - - i.e., makes informal as well as formal visits to departments.	9.

D. SUMMARY COMMENTS INCLUDE PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS, CONSTRUCTIVE SUGGESTIONS, CRITICISMS, ETC. (continue on reverse side)

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

December 1975

Dear _____,

I write to seek your participation in the review of the work of an administrative officer. This has become normal procedure at Dartmouth for those holding academic administrative appointments, and is now becoming routine for all administrative officers.

When (name) was appointed in 19__, it was agreed that I would initiate a review within a three-year period. There are no set procedures for this evaluation but I propose to seek written testimony from a number of persons who work with (name) or who by virtue of their interest in (science, the arts, research, etc.) are in a position to provide useful evaluation.

The letter you write and any subsequent interview we may have will be held in strict confidence. However I will provide a detailed summary to be shared with (name) the C.O.A. and the President. (name) will be fully apprised of how his/her leadership of (department) is perceived by others, but no names will be used.

In order to provide some structure for your response, I am listing eight questions to which I hope you will provide answers, unless the questions are inappropriate considering your relationship to (department). In addition, I would appreciate your summary comments in whatever way you choose to present them in order to do justice to both the (subject's position title) and (department) itself.

1. Does he/she provide leadership? Does he/she have good judgment?

2. Has his/her management of (department) been effective in terms both of the initiatives he/she has taken and his/her response to situations as they arose?

3. Does he/she communicate well?

4. Does he/she stay on top of the program and calendar, dealing promptly with issues as they arise?

5. Does he/she organize his/her staff, and does he/she then delegate effectively to them?

6. What are his/her greatest strengths? and shortcomings? In what ways could he/she have improved his/her performance as (title)?

7. On a scale of 1 to 9, 9 being truly outstanding, 5 being average and 1 being poor, how would you rate his/her performance over the last three years?

8. Have you any strong impressions of this persons role at Dartmouth which were not brought out in these questions?

I plan to present my report to (name) by (date) and would appreciate your response by (date). I reiterate the importance that both (name) and I attach to your response. I look forward to your answers.

Sincerely,

9

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

Louisiana State University

PS-35

Revision: 1

Effective: January 1, 1977

SUBJECT: Performance Evaluation of Professional, Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel

PURPOSE

To develop and maintain a system for the performance evaluation of professional, administrative and non-teaching academic personnel whereby, through use of a formal evaluation device and consultation between employee and immediate supervisor, improvement goals may be established.

GENERAL POLICY

1. On an annual basis, using "Evaluation of Professional Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel - Form 35-1," an evaluation of the performance of each professional, administrative and non-teaching academic employeee, will be made by the person's immediate superior. The completed evaluation form will be forwarded to the next higher authority for review and comment, and then placed on record in the employee's file in the Academic & Unclassified personnel office.

2. Where Form 35-1 is not appropriate for a unit or a particular job category, it is permissible to submit for approval a substitute form. The form, however, must provide an objective system for evaluation based on specified criteria.

3. Results of the evaluation are to be presented to each employee in a private conference by the supervisor and a discussion held on its contents. Should the employee disagree with the results of the evaluation, the person is invited to present a written statement to also be included in the permanent personnel record.

4. All persons holding professional and non-teaching academic appointments, including those who hold concurrent administrative and faculty appointments such as Deans and Department Chairpersons/Heads, will be included in the evaluation process under PS-35 for those segments of their duties which are associated with administrative appointments. Direct professorial functions are not to be included as part of the evaluation and are covered under PS-36.

5. The focus of evaluation will be on performance improvement, using each criterion as a standard with which to examine performance, and to identify strengths and weaknesses. An important aim of the system will be identification by the employee of improvement goals. Salary is not a part of this evaluation.

6. The completed evaluation form on each employee will become a permanent part of each person's personnel file. Therefore, the supervisor has a heavy responsibility to perform the evaluations as fairly, accurately, dispassionately and expertly as possible. Evaluations will be the basis of personnel decisions which must bear scrutiny by both University and governmental authorities.

7. For academic administrative positions (Deans, Directors, Department Chairpersons/Heads), it is appropriate to involve representative faculty in the evaluation process should they wish to become involved. This in no way, however, diminishes responsibility of the immediate superior for making final determination of the official rating. Policies about involvement of faculty in evaluation of performance of those in academic department administrative positions will be developed at the college level.

Personnel included under this PS (See PS-20 for more detail)

1. Academic Ranks

   Dean, Associates, Assistants, Assistants to
   Director, Associates, Assistants, Assistants to
   Head/Chairperson, Associates, Assistants, Assistant to
   Principal, Assistant
   Library Ranks (use of form designed specifically for the Library is approved)
   Associate
   Assistant

2. Continuing Education Ranks

   All

3. Administrative Ranks

   All

4. Professional Ranks

   All

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR

Louisiana State University

PS-35

Operating Procedures

Revision: 1

Effective: January 1, 1977

SUBJECT: Performance Evaluation of Professional, Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel

OPERATING PROCEDURES

1. At the end of each calendar year, evaluation forms will be completed by each supervisor on all professional and administrative personnel.

2. For each criterion, the following evaluative statements are being used:

Outstanding - Consistently and clearly performs functions in a superior manner; stands out clearly among those in a similar capacity.

Competent - Consistently performs well; meets the basic standards of performance required in the position. Three levels of competency are indicated; high, medium, low.

Under Official Review - Performance appears deficient; an official review is being made.

Unsatisfactory - Performance is unacceptable; considerable improvement in performance is necessary for continuation of appointment.

Not Applicable - The criterion does not apply or there is insufficient evidence with which to make a judgment.

3. The evaluation will be discussed privately with each employee. Each employee will initial the form to indicate that he/she has seen the evaluation.

4. Should the employee disagree with the evaluation, he/she may submit a written statement to be attached to the evaluation form.

5. The next higher authority will review the evaluation and indicate concurrence, or, if there is disagreement the reasons will be noted. The evaluation form, with any attachments, will be placed in the employee's file in the Academic & Unclassified personnel office.

6. In discussing results of the evaluation with the employee, strengths and weaknesses should be reviewed. Where weaknesses are identified, the employee should be assisted in understanding the nature of the weaknesses, planning a course of action to overcome them.

7. In the utilization of the form overall ratings of outstanding to employees should be very limited; at the very maximum 10% of the personnel in a unit would be a guide. Such ratings should be reserved for those who truly merit the label of outstanding.

8. The evaluations are due in the Academic & Unclassified Personnel Office by January 15, of each year.

DEFINITIONS

For the criteria stipulated in the evaluation form, the following definitional statements are intended as amplification.

1. Concept of the job refers to the employee's perception of the position compared with the position description on file in the Personnel Office. Is this perception appropriate? valid? realistic?

2. Appropriateness of goals and objectives is an indicator that an employee should have some definite, job related objectives to which he/she is working, and these should be apparent over time. Are these objectives and goals appropriate? valid? realistic?

3. Capability for performing the job is concerned with the basic capacity of the employee to meet the demands of the job from the standpoint of training and experience. Does the employee have appropriate expertise? training? experience?

4. Quality of work refers to the work product and its relative merit. How good is the product, tangible or intangible, and what are its relative merits; compared with generally accepted standards of criteria.

5. Ability to evaluate accomplishments is concerned with the capacity to review what has been done, to determine if output is good, and to review the methods and procedures utilized to determine effectiveness and efficiency.

6. Appropriateness of managing subordinates is a fundamental question. Can the employee effectively direct people under his/her supervision? Are relationships satisfactory? Does the group work well together? Are the employees well-oriented and productive?

7. Ability to plan, lead and evaluate a comprehensive program is concerned with the overall unit the employee leads, and its relative functional capacity as an entity. As a unit, are goals clear and challenging, is the plan of execution workable and are evaluations made as appropriate.

8. Meeting responsibilities and deadlines implies a faithfulness in discharging duties of the job on time and as called for.

9. Ability to work with others revolves around personal relationships among peers. Can the employee work with others effectively and efficiently.

10. Regularity of work habits is concerned with punctuality, dependability and reliability.

11. Attitude in meeting the various publics the office serves is a most essential guideline. The manner in which one meets the clientele the office serves, handles their questions, and settles their problems is most important.

12. Receptivity to new ideas infers that employees should have an open mind, be willing to accept suggestions, be inquiring in the sense of wanting to improve, etc.

13. Taking part in professional improvement activities is concerned with the willingness to learn from others, to participate in training as needed, available and appropriate.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FORM 35-1

Evaluation of Professional, Administrative and Non-Teaching Academic Personnel

Name_____ Position_____

Unit_____

Criterion	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory	Under Official Review	Competent			Outstanding
				Low	Med.	High	
Job Performance							
1. Appropriateness of Employee's Conception of the Job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Appropriateness of Goals and Objectives	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Capability for Performing Job	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Quality of Work Performed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Ability to Evaluate Accomplishments	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments (Items 1-5)							
Overall Job Performance Evaluation							
Leadership on the Job							
6. Appropriateness of Handling Subordinates	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Ability to Plan, Lead and Evaluate a Comprehensive Program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

15

16

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FORM 35-1

	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory	Under Official Review	Competent			Outstanding
				Low	Med.	High	
Overall Evaluation - Professional Improvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

General Evaluation

Strengths:

Areas for Improvement (Goals for the ensuing year)

Overall Evaluation - General	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Employee Initials _____ Date _____

Unit Head _____ Date _____

Reviewing Authority _____ Date _____

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY

FORM 35-1

	Not Applicable	Unsatisfactory	Under Official Review	Competent			Outstanding
				Low	Med.	High	
Comments (Items 6-7)							
Overall Leadership Evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Attitudes and Work Habits							
8. Meeting Responsibilities and Deadlines	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Ability to Work With Others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Regularity of Work Habits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Attitude in Meeting the Various Publics the Office Serves	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments (Items 8-11)							
Overall Evaluation - Attitudes and Work Habits	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Professional Improvement							
12. Receptivity of New Ideas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Taking Part in Professional Improvement Activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Comments (Items 12-13)							

FROM FACULTY MANUAL

FACULTY GOVERNMENT

The revised Charter and Bylaws were approved by vote of the Faculty on June 15, 1967. Some revisions were approved by the Faculty Senate on September 27, 1965. The whole document was approved by the Board of Trustees on November 22, 1967.

CHARTER

I. PREAMBLE

1.1. A university is a community of scholars contributing, each according to his own talents and interests, to the transmission and advancement of knowledge. Because of its diversity of interests, a university is a complex organization, not quite like any other in its management, which requires the understanding and good faith of people dedicated to a common purpose. A university administration must seek wisely and diligently to advance the common effort, and the strength of a university is greatest when its faculty and administration join for the advancement of common objectives.

1.2. Much of the existing faculty-administration relationship has been established through long experience and has the weight and good sense of academic form and tradition. Some of the traditions of the University of Miami are given expression and are extended in this document. Yet these and other common understandings have meaning only to the extent that they reflect the integrity and faith of the faculty and administration in the day-by-day accomplishment of their joint effort.

II. DEFINITIONS

2.1. The University faculty consists of the President, the vice-presidents holding professorial appointments, the academic deans, the professors, the associate professors, the assistant professors and the instructors, whether serving in teaching, research, or administrative appointments, whether serving part-time or full-time and whether serving in an active or an emeritus capacity. The President of the University is the presiding officer of the University faculty.

2.2. The voting members of the University faculty are those members of the University faculty who (1) hold the rank of professor, associate professor, assistant professor, or instructor, (2) serve full-time in their appointments at the University of Miami, and (3) devote at least half-time to teaching or research duties, or other activities of an academically related nature.

2.3. The term *school* means a school or college of the University, including the Graduate School, having its own faculty, and academic program leading

to a degree. The library shall have status equivalent to that of a school and its director shall be considered to be the dean. The term department includes undepartmentalized schools and divisions of a school.

2.4. The voting members in a department or school are those voting members of the University faculty holding at least half-time (as specified in the annual renewal of appointment) appointments in the department or school. A voting member of the University who holds half-time appointments in two departments or two schools, excluding the Graduate School, shall in a written statement to the secretary of the Senate, elect one department or school for all voting privileges.

2.5. The term *President* shall mean the President of the University or any person, committee or council he authorizes to act for him in specified areas, except where the context clearly refers to the President as an individual.

2.6. A *graduate degree* as herein referred to is any earned post-baccalaureate degree administered by the Graduate School.

2.7. The term *election* shall mean, throughout, election by formal written ballot.

III. AUTHORITY OF THE FACULTY

3.1. The University faculty is authorized to enact regulations and to formulate rules for the immediate government of the University in such matters as: curriculum, scholastic standards, graduation and honors, approval of candidates for earned degrees, and examinations and testing programs. The University faculty is authorized to share with the President in decisions regarding the future development of the University including the institution of new schools, degrees, departments, curricula, and the like; in the enactment of regulations and the formulation of rules for the immediate government of the University pertaining to: educational and research policy and general welfare; the future development of the University; environmental conditions; student conduct and activities; requirements for admission and exclusion of students; faculty appointment, retention, tenure and promotion; the University budget; the appointment and retention of administrative officers; faculty teaching loads; and the responsibilities and duties of faculty members. Normal procedures for decision-making in each of these matters shall be consistent with the differing functional responsibilities of the President and the University faculty. In order to exercise these responsibilities the University faculty is authorized to establish its own organization and rules of procedure. Under this authority the University faculty hereby establishes the Faculty Senate (hereinafter referred to as the Senate) as its legislative and executive agency.

3.2. The following powers and duties are granted to the faculty of each school, excepting the Graduate School and the Library: to determine its requirements for admission and graduation; to determine the scholastic standards required of its students; to approve those of its students who qualify for degrees; to participate in the determination of teaching loads,

faculties; to participate in the selection and retention of its administrative officers. These powers and duties are subject, however, to the authority of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University or which are necessary for the coordination of the various schools and, except when specifically delegated to the faculty, are subject also to the authority of the President. In order to exercise these responsibilities the graduate faculty is authorized to determine its own organization and rules of procedure. Under this authority the graduate faculty shall establish a Council as its executive agency.

3.5. The following powers and duties are granted to the faculty of the Library: to participate in the appointment, retention, promotion and award of tenure and merit salary increases to its members; to participate in the selection and retention of its administrative officers; to promote the educational and research policy and the general welfare of the Library. These powers and duties are subject, however, to the authority of the Senate to determine policies which affect the general welfare of the University or which are necessary for the coordination of the various schools and, except when specifically delegated to the faculty, are subject also to the authority of the President. In order to exercise these responsibilities the faculty of the Library is authorized to determine its own organization and rules of procedure. Under this authority the faculty of the Library shall establish a Council as its executive agency.

IV. SCHOOL COUNCILS

4.1. The faculty of each school, including the Graduate School and the Library, shall establish a council as its executive agency. The voting members of the faculty of each school shall elect from their members a Council which shall have the following duties and responsibilities: It shall act as the committee on academic planning, educational and research policy, and general welfare of the school; it shall elect all committees of the school faculty; it shall act as confidential counsel to the dean of the school in any matter submitted by the dean; it or its designee shall set the date and hour and prepare the agenda for all regular meetings of the school faculty; it shall include in the agenda any matter requested in writing by ten percent of the voting members of the school faculty; it may make recommendations to the school faculty concerning proposed actions; it may act for the school faculty, as authorized annually by the school faculty, and report such actions at the next meeting of the school faculty. The authority of the Council to elect committees of the school faculty in no way limits the authority of the dean of appoint *ad hoc* committees from the school faculty to advise him.

4.2. The School Council shall consist of at least three members, each serving for a three-year term, the terms to be staggered in order to provide continuity. The Council of a school containing a small number of faculty members may consist of all voting members of the school faculty. The dean of the school shall be the Chairman of the Council. Should a member of the Council resign or should his position for any other reason become vacant his

THIS is the basis on which the LIBRARY Council operates. AW

Committee. Supporting information on each seriously considered candidate shall be compiled and made available to the Consultive Committee, and an opportunity shall be provided for an interview with the Committee and for a vote by the Committee which shall be reported to the appointing agent, in a manner specified in the bylaws. Normally, consistent with the information provided by the Consultive Committee, but also exercising his personal judgment relative to the effect of the appointment on the general welfare of the department, school, University and profession, the dean of the school shall appoint department chairmen, the President shall appoint the deans and the Dean of the Faculties, and the Board of Trustees shall appoint the President.

11.3. At four-year intervals, (as initially determined by the Dean of the Faculties) each voting member of each department, other than the department chairmen, shall be afforded an opportunity to express his opinion as to whether the interests of his department, profession and the University would be best served by replacement or retention of its chairman. The secretary to the Senate shall initiate the vote and transmit the resulting information to the appointing agent and to the Dean of the Faculties. The process shall ensure the anonymity of each respondent. In addition, when deemed advisable by the appointing authority, or when deemed necessary by the Senate Council, the appropriate faculty shall be consulted as to its opinion that the interests of the department, school, University and profession would be best served by the retention or replacement of an administrator. The Senate Council is charged with the accumulation of such opinions and the reporting of summaries thereof to the appointing authority. If a decision is then made which is inconsistent with the expressed opinions of the consulted faculty, the appointing authority shall present a written explanation of his decision to the Senate Council for transmission to the consulted faculty. However, the Senate Council shall not initiate such procedures unless there is reported evidence of improper administrative practices which continued after consultation with the administrator involved.

Modified by later Senate action To require evaluation of Deans every 4 years. Ath

XII. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, MERIT SALARY INCREASES, PROMOTIONS AND TENURE

12.1. The primary responsibility in nomination for new appointments of the faculty which do not involve the immediate award of tenure rests with the chairman of the department to which the appointment is made. Qualified members of the department faculty shall be consulted and the recommendations will ordinarily be made in conformity with the results of this consultation. At the discretion of the chairman of the department, the responsibility for new appointments not involving the immediate award of tenure may be assigned to an appointed committee. Recommendations on appointments along with all supporting information shall be submitted by the chairman to the Dean of the Faculties for decision, through the dean of the school. The dean of the school may also submit his own recommendations.

12.2. When a new appointment which involves the immediate award of tenure is favorably considered by a department chairman, or when it is time to consider the renewal of a non-tenured appointment to the faculty, or when it is time to consider the award of tenure to a faculty member, the following

UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI
CORAL GABLES, FLORIDA 33124

CONFIDENTIAL

FACULTY SENATE

April 30, 1976

To: Dr. Archie L. McNeal

From: Shepard M. Faber, Chairman, Faculty Senate

re: #75026 -- Opinion Survey-Evaluation of Deans

In compliance with Senate Action of December 15, 1975 (and as amended by the Faculty Senate January 26, 1976) the attached questionnaire was mailed each full-time faculty member of your school, reported by your office as eligible to participate in senate elections.

Enclosed are the results of the survey as well as comments pertinent to question #22.

Shepard M. Faber

SMF:mk
encls.

cc: Dr. Henry King Stanford

Please note: There were no comments written on any of the questionnaire's returned.

25

March 1, 1976

OPINION SURVEY
EVALUATION OF DEANS

S A M P L E

To: All Full-time Faculty Members
School of _____

From: Gary I. Salzman, Chairman, Faculty Senate

Re: #75026 -- Opinion Survey as approved by the Faculty Senate on December 15, 1975 and as amended by the Faculty Senate January 26, 1976.

Questionnaire is to be returned, anonymously, within 30 days of the above date to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate, 212 Ashe. The results will go to the President, Dean of Faculties, the Dean involved and held in the Senate Office for review for any one from the individual School who wants to see it.

	Yes	No	Unable to Judge
1. Has the Dean provided progressive leadership for the development of the School in the areas of:			
a. Education	___	___	_____
b. Research	___	___	_____
c. Faculty Morale	___	___	_____
2. Is the Dean a good administrator?	___	___	_____
3. Has the Dean manifested an awareness of her/his responsibility to the faculty of the School in matters relating to:			
a. Education	___	___	_____
b. Research	___	___	_____
c. Administrative Affairs	___	___	_____
4. Has the Dean vigorously supported her/his School's efforts to obtain its appropriate share of the University budget?	___	___	_____
5. Has the Dean functioned properly in her/his responsibility as appointing agent of departmental chairmen?	___	___	_____
6. Is the Dean the type of individual to whom you can appeal when the Chairman has acted arbitrarily?	___	___	_____

#/3025 -- Opinion Survey

	Yes	No	Unable to Judge
7. Does the Dean hold regular meetings of the School faculty and preside in a fair and effective manner?	___	___	_____
8. Has the Dean dominated the School Council?	___	___	_____
9. Has the Dean pressured vigorously for the continuous improvement of the faculty?	___	___	_____
10. Has the Dean been readily available for consultation with faculty?	___	___	_____
11. Has the Dean responded to departmental requests within a reasonable period of time?	___	___	_____
12. Has the Dean acted professionally in her/his recommendation regarding promotions and award of tenure?	___	___	_____
13. Does the Dean recognize and support the professional integrity, respectability, dignity, and accomplishments of the faculty of the School?	___	___	_____
14. Does the Dean attempt to maintain a fair and effective relationship with faculty members of the School?	___	___	_____
15. Does the Dean encourage faculty participation in the activities of the School?	___	___	_____
16. Has the Dean, as required by the Faculty Manual, received approval from the School faculty for any changes in School policy?	___	___	_____
17. Have the Dean's decisions shown undeserved preference or prejudice to individual faculty members?	___	___	_____
18. Have the Dean's decisions shown preference or prejudice to selected departments in her/his School?	___	___	_____

#75026 -- Opinion Survey

		Yes	No	Unable to Judge
19.	Has the Dean interfered unduly with the internal operations of any department?	___	___	_____
20.	Is the Dean too preoccupied with administrative details and not sufficiently concerned with the broader picture?	___	___	_____
21.	Does the Dean delegate too many administrative decisions to the faculty or faculty committees?	___	___	_____

22. Please make any comments not called for in the above inquiry which you believe may contribute to a better evaluation of the Dean. (Please use reverse side of this paper)

23. In your opinion, the interests of your School, profession, and University, would best be served if the Dean were:

Replaced_____ Retained_____ No Opinion_____

24. In your over-all judgment, the performance of the Dean should be rated as:

a. Excellent _____
b. Good _____
c. Average _____
d. Poor _____
e. Very poor _____

vost for the administration, well-being and development of the Freshman Year of Studies.

The Dean of the Freshman Year of Studies is assisted in the duties of his Office by Assistant Deans, who are appointed by the President and who perform such duties and exercise such authority as may be delegated to them by the Dean.

Section 8/The Dean of Continuing Education

The Dean of Continuing Education is appointed by the President. Within the framework of University policies and procedures, he has full authority in the general regulation and administration of the affairs of the Center for Continuing Education. He is responsible to the Provost for the orderly development of the University's continuing education programs.

Section 9/Chairmen of Departments

The Chairman of a Department is appointed by the President for a stated term, usually three years, and may be reappointed. When a Chairman of a Department is to be appointed, the Dean of the College consults formally with all departmental faculty and, when appropriate, with the Vice President for Advanced Studies. The Dean of the College reports their recommendations to the Provost along with his own. Procedure for reappointment is the same as for appointment.

Within the framework of University policies and procedures, the Chairman of a Department has responsibility, under the Dean of the College, and when appropriate, the Vice President for Advanced Studies, for the administration, well-being and development of the Department, its faculty, course of studies, and diverse activities.

Section 10/Directors of University Institutes

The Director of a University Institute is appointed by the President. A University Institute is a major organization of the University not contained within a College, and devoted to advanced study and teaching, and research. Such an Institute is governed by special statutes approved by the President upon recommendation of the Academic Council.

Within the framework of University policies and procedures, the Director of an Institute has responsibility, under the Provost and in cooperation with other appropriate academic officers, for the administration, well-being and development of the Institute, its faculty, staff, programs, and diverse activities.

Section 11/Director of University Libraries

The Director of University Libraries is appointed by the President; his appointment is subject to formal review every five years. When an appointment is to be made, the Provost consults the Faculty Committee for University Libraries and the Committee on Appointments and Promotions of the Library, and accepts nominations from them. The same committees are consulted for the five-year review.

The Director of University Libraries is responsible for the development and security of the collections of books, manuscripts, and research materials of the University Library system and for the general administration of all libraries, their services and functions. He is an ex officio member of the Faculty Committee for University Libraries and acts as executive officer of its policy decisions.

Section 12/University Registrar

The University Registrar is appointed by the President. He assists the Provost in the work of academic administration in whatever way the Provost may desire.

Section 13/Director of Admissions

The Director of Admissions is appointed by the President. He has responsibility, under the Provost, for the admission of all undergraduate students. He is advised by the University Committee on Admissions.

Section 14/Director of the University Art Gallery

The Director of the University Art Gallery is appointed by the President. He has responsibility, under the Provost, for the development and security of the art collection.

Section 15/University Archivist

The University Archivist is appointed by the President. He has responsibility under the Provost for the collection and maintenance of the official records and papers of the University as well as other documents of enduring historical value.

Article III, The Faculty

Section 1/Membership

The Faculty consists of the President: the Academic Officers identified in Article II; the Teaching-and-Research Faculty; the Special Research Faculty; the Library Faculty; the Special Profes-

Nicholas Fiore
Chairman, Department of Metallurgical Engineering and Materials Science

Kenneth Jameson
Department of Economics

Gerald Jones
Department of Physics

Lee A. Tavis
Department of Finance

Appointed:

Rev. Thomas Blantz, C.S.C.
Chairman, Department of History

Fernand Dutile
The Law School

Donald Schmid
Academic Commissioner, Student Government

Item II: The Search Committee for the Director of University Libraries

At its meeting of Dec. 14, 1979 the Academic Council recommended change in the Academic Manual affecting search committees for the provost, the vice president for advanced studies, the deans of the colleges and the dean of the Freshman Year of Studies.

At this meeting the council continued this discussion relevant to the search committee for the director of University libraries (Article II, Section 11 of the Academic Manual.) At hand for consideration were a recommendation from the Faculty Senate, one from the Crowe Committee, (cf Minutes of the Academic Council Meeting, Dec. 14, 1979) one from the Faculty Committee for University Libraries, and, of course, the present statement in the Manual.

In order to coordinate the consideration of these various recommendations, a series of questions was presented to and resolved by the Academic Council. They follow:

1. Is the committee, however constituted, to be elected or appointed?

   The council approved: members of the committee are to be elected.

2. Is there to be a component of the committee from the library faculty? If so, how determined?

   The council approved: 1) There should be members from the library faculty on the committee and 2) they should be elected by the library faculty.

3. Should any members of the committee be from the library staff? If so how many?

   Discussion: It was stated the library staff should be represented on the committee. There are 80-90 people involved. They so interact with the director, it is important they be on the search committee.--It was noted that this opened up a new principle, namely that staff should be involved in administrative functions.--It was noted the staff in the library functions differently than elsewhere in the University. It is not the same as a staff in a college.--In discussing the proposal to include staff on the committee the problem of precedent was also discussed.

   The council defeated the motion that there should be one staff member on the committee. The vote: 30 opposed; 27 in favor.

4. Should there be members of the teaching-and-research faculty on the committee? If so how are they to be chosen or appointed?

   The council approved:

   1. There should be members of the regular teaching-and-research faculty on the committee.
   2. They should be elected by the Faculty Committee for University Libraries.

5. Who chairs the committee?

   The council approved: The provost is to chair the committee.

6. How many members should constitute the committee?

   The council approved: There should be five members on the committee plus the chairman.

7. How should the five members be distributed:

   The council approved by a 33-24 vote that three members be from the library faculty and two members from the regular teaching-and-research faculty.

8. Should the concurrence of the committee be required for appointment of the director of University libraries?

   The council voted to require concurrence of the committee.

9. Should there be student representatives on the committee?

   The council defeated by a vote of 31-26 the proposal that there be student representation on the committee.

   It was, however, understood by the council that the provost or the director of University libraries should invite input from the library staff and from students.

Item III: An Appeals Procedure.

At its meeting of April 30, 1980, the Academic Council discussed in general terms the desirability of an appeals procedure and the general principles and problems inherent in any such procedure. It also considered specific proposals approved by the Faculty Senate. This discussion concluded with approval of this motion: "The council declines to endorse the specific proposal created by the Faculty Senate but requests that the matter of review of promotion and tenure decisions be prepared for the agenda of the council at its next meeting by the executive committee of the Academic Council."

Professor O'Meara announced the executive committee had prepared a procedure. It is presented to the council with the unanimous approval of the executive committee.

The proposal as approved by the council follows later in these minutes.

The proposal as approved differs from that presented by the executive committee in specifying that: appeal does not suspend the existing decision, the procedure is intended for regular members of the teaching-and-research faculty, and in stating that if an aggrieved person wishes to take action, it should be taken prior to Jan. 15, 1981.

Discussion:

It was noted that in any appeals or review process it is necessary to stay away from academic standards and decisions on quality of work.--To the question as to why the reviewer should be appointed rather than elected it was answered that the reason was confidentiality. Confidentiality is under attack around the country and it is the cornerstone of our business. Election would increase the risk of breach of confidentiality. One person, rather than several, should be appointed to restrict number of persons with access to the confidential material.--The input from the reviewer will be put in the new package which then goes through the same process.--The appointment of the reviewer by the provost has its problems. If the Academic Council or the provost appointed a review board for the year, there would be no charge of rigging the process. But it was noted the provost consults with the aggrieved person.--If there is personal bias it will not be removed by review by the same group.--If there is a different committee how to get a committee that is qualified to pass professional judgment on the quality of the work?--The question is to give the aggrieved a hearing. The number of people involved in the original process makes it almost impossible for personal bias to be operative. And certainly it would seem clear there is no personal bias that could get through the same group twice.--We now have a good procedure. If we start adding superstructure to it the departmental committees on appointments and promotions will be in a less powerful or influential or useful position.

ADMINISTRATOR EVALUATION FORM UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

In an effort to assess and improve the effectiveness of University administrators, we are asking for your responses to a number of statements that describe administrators. One form is to be used for evaluating the Provost and the other form is for evaluating your Dean. Please fill in the name of the person you are evaluating. Please return the Provost's evaluation to the President's Office and the Dean's evaluation to the Provost's Office by MAR 6 1981.

The evaluations are anonymous. Summaries of the results will be shared with the administrators.

This is an evaluation of _____.

Using the following numerical scale, please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement listed below as it relates to the above administrator.

Rating Scale

5 - Strongly Agree

4 - Somewhat Agree

3 - Mixed Feelings

2 - Somewhat Disagree

1 - Strongly Disagree

0 - Insufficient Information to Judge

Based on my personal experience and/or indirect knowledge, this administrator:

	Response
1. Makes timely and sound decisions.	_____
2. Works with others in an understanding and fair manner.	_____
3. Is available for advice and consultation.	_____
4. Understands and follows established policies and procedures.	_____
5. Willingly and accurately shares appropriate information.	_____
6. Plans well and has a clear understanding of goals and priorities.	_____
7. Is receptive to constructive suggestions for change.	_____
8. Places an appropriate emphasis on academic quality and standards.	_____
9. Handles day-to-day administrative responsibilities skillfully and effectively.	_____
10. Is an overall effective academic leader.	_____

General Comments: (Use reverse side, if necessary.)

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

The University Library
405 624 6321

74074

March 27, 1981

I am enclosing herewith the material you requested from the OSU Library concerned with the annual evaluation of the Library director. The participation of Library department heads in this process has been in effect for two years, i.e., provision of input to the vice-president on a voluntary basis. This year for the first time, other professional librarians were asked to volunteer an evaluation of the Library director, if they wished to participate. The information was forwarded direct to the office of the vice president.

In the evaluation interview that I held with the vice president, he used the appraisal memorandum which I wrote to him (deans normally do not use the appraisal form but write the vice president a detailed memorandum outlining duties and responsibilities, assignments, and accomplishments of the last year) as a basis for the conversation and any recommendations he wished to make for me. In a general way he commented on the compiled results of the evaluation statements received from my library faculty. He does not give me a written statement detailing his evaluation of my work for the year.

Roscoe Rouse

Roscoe Rouse
Dean of Library Services

RR:skw
Enclosures

33

Oklahoma State University

Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research

STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74078
WHITEHURST HALL
(405) 624-5627

MEMORANDUM

TO: Assistant Librarian, Director, Department and Division Heads

FROM: J. H. Boggs

SUBJECT: Participation in Annual Evaluation of Academic Deans

It is the policy of OSU that the effectiveness and productivity of academic administrators be examined and assessed annually. The basic purpose of this activity is to determine if the person is successfully performing and achieving the established roles and requirements of the position. I am asking you at this time to aid me in my annual evaluation of Dr. Roscoe Rouse.

As a member of the administration, it is expected that this individual give leadership in the development of meaningful programs and services complementary to the purposes and mission of the University. Further, the administrator is expected to (1) see that goals, objectives and priorities are established and achieved for the unit; (2) manage the personnel and fiscal affairs of the unit; and, (3) interpret University policy and procedures to the faculty and staff.

Please use the attached memorandum to complete a narrative assessment. Your input will be of use to me in completing this administrator's annual appraisal. Anonymity of your response will be maintained.

According to established procedures, I will review and summarize all information given me and will discuss the summary with the administrators being evaluated. If an obvious disparity exists between my evaluation and substantive input from others, I will discuss the differences in perceptions of performance with the members of the administrators academic unit.

Please give your assessment serious consideration and return it to me no later than February 2, 1981. Your participation is most important to the success of this appraisal process.

"Confidential"

Annual Administrator Performance Appraisal
Faculty/Staff Assessment

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSED Dr. Roscoe Rouse DATE _____

POSITION University Librarian

CRITERIA FOR USE IN ASSESSING ADMINISTRATOR PERFORMANCE:

On the reverse side of this form, please complete a narrative assessment of the effectiveness of the administrator named above. In formulating your perceptions of this administrator's annual performance, you might wish to address the following general expectations of performance in administrative positions:

-Comprehension and acceptance of the role the administrator's unit is expected to play within the overall mission of the University

-Planning priorities and achieving unit goals and objectives consistent with the purposes and mission of the University

-Prompt and reliable attention to administrative details

-Communication, interpretation and fair application of administrative policies and procedures

-Effective interaction with faculty and all levels of administration

-Effectiveness in obtaining and utilizing the resources (fiscal, physical and human) needed for the unit to achieve its purposes

-Availability for and effectiveness in openly communicating and assisting faculty, staff and students

-Provision of leadership and opportunities for the professional development of faculty and staff and for the continued development of programs within the unit

-Maintenance of esprit-de-corps and high morale within the unit

-Effective anticipation of and/or reconciliation of strained relationships within the unit

-Continued academic and professional development and achievement

Input from faculty/staff will be reviewed, summarized and discussed with the administrator being evaluated. Anonymity will be maintained and feedback will be provided if an obvious disparity exists between the overall appraisal and substantive faculty/staff input.

35

(over)

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
ACTIVITY APRAISAL AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Name _____ **Date** _____

Department _____

DIRECTIONS

Please provide an accurate profile of your activities, but be as brief as practical. Long-term activities should include an indication of progress made during the appraisal period. If necessary, additional sheets may be attached to complete your responses. State clearly the part of the form to which added comments belong. It is suggested that a current curriculum vita be attached to this document.

SECTION I: BASIC INFORMATION

TEACHING:

List teaching responsibilities which are not reflected in the printout.
(Course revisions, advising, supervision of teaching assistants, development of instructional materials, visual aids, etc.)

RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITIES:

PUBLICATIONS:

EXTENSION:

SERVICE AND OTHER PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Consulting service(s) rendered and the amount of time involved.

Divide your response into departmental, college, and university categories for committees, councils, task forces, etc.

Other professional activities.

SPECIAL AWARDS AND RECOGNITIONS:

SECTION II: APPRAISAL

DIRECTIONS

Appraise the overall contribution and performance of the faculty member. Identify the overall assessment using the definitions provided and develop a written statement supporting the judgment rendered. The statement should include specific reference to the person's performance in the several central professional activities relevant to a faculty member of your department, including specific comments on the quality of performance in instruction , research and publication, extension/public service, and/or university service. If performance is deficient, a plan of corrective action must be recommended under Section III.

Appraise the person in relation to his or her peers (i.e., departmental faculty) and in relation to contributions to the department in his or her defined role. Each department, school, or college should establish explicit criteria against which performance is to be measured (e.g., research and publications, instruction, etc.). These criteria should reflect both the goals of the unit and the professional standards of excellence common to the discipline. Department heads should make certain that the faculty member being appraised clearly understands these criteria.

If a person has a split appointment, the form is to be completed by the head of the home department after consulting with the other department head(s) to whom the person reports. All immediate department heads are expected to sign or initial this form. If the department heads disagree significantly in their evaluations, the matter shall be brought to the attention of the appropriate reviewing official before the conference for resolution of differences.

Please use the following definitions.

SM SPECIAL MERIT — Outstanding or exceptional performance which consistently and significantly exceeds the normal requirements of the position.

M MERIT — High performance which usually produces results which exceed the requirements of the position.

G GOOD — Good performance which consistently meets all normal requirements of the position.

NI NEEDS IMPROVEMENT — Performance which is below what is normally expected of the position, but improvement can be achieved and is expected in the immediate future.

U UNSATISFACTORY — Consistently inadequate performance which does not meet the normal requirements of the position and a necessary improvement has not been forthcoming.

OVERALL EVALUATION:_____ **Date**_____

SUPPORTING STATEMENT:

SECTION III: CONFERENCE ON APPRAISAL

The individual faculty member and the department head will meet to discuss the appraisal. Additional comments by either party may be made to clarify or expand upon material presented above. If overall assessment is "Needs Improvement" or "Unsatisfactory," a plan for corrective action should be included in this section. If areas of significant disagreement exist, they should be noted below. (The faculty member must prepare the response to be included on this form within 2 working days after the conference.)

Faculty member's signature _____ **Date** _____

Department head's signature _____ **Date** _____

Dean's signature _____ **Date** _____

(If disagreement is indicated above, the Dean must indicate in writing a formal response within 30 days after the conference date.)

SECTION IV: FACULTY ASSIGNMENT AND DEVELOPMENT

Specify (a) the activities the person should emphasize, (b) the activities the person should maintain, and (c) the special developmental activities and high-priority objectives which the person should engage in and work toward during the coming year.

RECOMMENDED OBJECTIVES:

ANTICIPATED ASSIGNMENT FOR FOLLOWING YEAR:

Faculty member's signature _____ Date _____

41

Department head's signature _____ Date _____

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY

REVIEW OF ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY POLICY MANUAL

PURPOSE: To describe the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office and to provide for the evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership in carrying out the functions of the office in light of the organization and other factors which may impinge on the office.

To provide guidance to the academic administrative officer as to strengths and weaknesses of the leadership of that office for the purpose of improving the functioning of the office.

To make recommendations, as deemed appropriate, to the next highest academic administrative officer based on the information developed on the organization and functioning of an academic administrative office and the resulting evaluation of the effectiveness of the leadership of that office. The recommendations are to be directed at the improvement of the office and its leadership. If there are instances where a change in leadership is proposed, this information is to be included.

DEFINITION: For the purposes of this policy, an academic administrative office is one which reports directly or indirectly to the Provost of the University.

PROCESS: Because of the diversity of the University, the specific process for periodic review of academic administrative offices is not prescribed for each unit.

Each academic administrative officer directly responsible to the Provost shall, in consultation with the Provost and the appropriate administrative and faculty groups for that office, develop a process for the review of those academic administrative offices reporting to him or her within guidelines listed below.

The processes shall include mechanisms whereby faculty of the pertinent unit shall be informed when the review is started, when the review is completed, and that the next highest academic administrative officer has been informed of the results of the review.

GUIDELINES: Academic administrative offices of the University shall be reviewed at intervals of about five years so as to result in no more than twenty percent of the academic administrative offices being reviewed each year. Sometimes it may be desirable to initiate a review when a principal academic office is vacated, e.g., by resignation or retirement.

Responsibility for initiating and implementing the periodic review of academic administrative offices rests with the administrator at the next highest level.

Academic members of the unit being reviewed shall be significantly involved in the review process. Appropriate academic members from other related units and academic administrative peers are recommended to be included in the review process.

The general results of the review shall be made known to the responsible academic administrative officer by the next highest academic administrative officer. Confidentiality of personnel evaluations shall be maintained.

July 1, 1976

UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER

29 May 1979

Procedures for Quinquennial Review *

In the following, "he" is used in place of "he or she" and "his" in place of "his or hers."

1. The following procedures will apply to the first evaluations conducted. Changes may be necessary to accommodate the larger numbers evaluated subsequently. In several places in these procedures it is assumed that the supervisor is a person other than the Dean or Director of the individual's College or Division or unit. When such is not the case, the team may add an appropriate individual.

The evaluation will be conducted by a team made up of the Provost and Senior Vice-President, one of whom will chair each team, the Director of Personnel, the Dean or Director of the individual's College or Division or unit, and one person who has a role as a user or participant in the service concerned. In special cases additional members may be added or substituted. Considerations of confidentiality should be taken into account by the team's chairman in deciding whether all materials should be made available to every team member.

In cases in which the seniority of the individual is such that he reports to no Dean or Director, special review committees will be appointed following the principles involved in structuring the above review teams.

2. On day one the chairman will notify the individual and the supervisor of the proposed evaluation. The individual will be requested to provide a curriculum vitae (see enclosure) which will be reviewed with the supervisor prior to submission, and also a confidential letter to the chairman describing his career objectives, relations with supervisors and supervised, satisfactions and resources in the present position, and thoughts about present and future levels of compensation. Final material will be provided to the chairman of the appraisal team within 4 weeks.

The chairman will arrange within 10 days of day one a meeting with the supervisor and the Dean or Director of the individual's College or unit. This group will identify the person who is to serve on the committee as a user or participant, and decide upon the identity of the referents from whom written opinions will be sought. The supervisor should have consulted with the individual prior to this meeting to seek guidance on referents (these may include subordinates, peers, superordinates, and users of or participants in a service) and the user or participant on the team. The chairman will solicit written opinions from the referents (see enclosure) and request a response within two weeks. He will also obtain the complete personnel files of the individual.

(Continued)

* No one in the library has been reviewed under this program. However, the library director will be at the appropriate time.

On day thirty the chairman will review the material received, distribute it to the review team, and arrange a meeting of the team as soon as possible, preferably within one week. Arrangements will be made to review the written material, meet with the individual, and prepare an evaluation and recommendations. Subsequently the chairman will meet with the individual and the supervisor to review a written summary evaluation. The individual may, if he wishes, submit a written response to the summary.

3. The final report of the quinquennial review will normally be prepared by the chairman; it may require an additional meeting of the team. The report will include a confidential statement about the career opportunities and potential of the individual, stating what sort of position he or she might reasonably expect to acheive and in what period of time (e.g. "Loggs is ready to head an administrative department immediately." or "Smith is young and talented, but needs further experience in accounting and application of computer technology; in about three years he should be ready to undertake the headship of an administrative department.") There should be as specific a career plan as possible for each individual. Precise recommendations should be made, where possible, about the courses which he might take, whether they be formal college courses or special education programs offered through Personnel or other agencies. In some cases, a more general statement about areas for improvement might be appropriate, such as "Jones is bright and energetic, but speaks and writes poorly. He should be told about the need to improve these aspects."

4. We shall need to think about ways to promote mobility throughout the whole University system. Deliberate attempts should be made to expose outstanding people to very different facets of the administrative system, and (perhaps even more difficult) to facilitate movement amongst the colleges, so that people can be brought on with wide experience of the whole set of colleges.

5. Although one would be able to give some indications of where an individual can and will go as the next phase in his or her career, there will be many cases in which the appropriate opportunities do not exist at present. Outstanding performance in such cases should lead to improvement in salaries.

6. The long-term objective is to have each individual evaluated five years after his appointment to a particular position, and thereafter at five-yearly intervals. It will take some years to move to that position. In the interim, determinations of the timetable for review will be made by the Vice-President for Planning and Budgets, the Senior Vice-President and Treasurer, and the Provost. Requests for evaluations

(Continued)

from individuals or their supervisors or deans or directors will be accommodated to the extent possible, but another factor that must be taken into account is the need to group the evaluations so that the team with some particular dean or director on it can handle a series of reviews. With this proviso, an effort will be made to arrange for reviews with senior people to be given priority.

Curriculum Vitae

Note: The format proposed here does not have to be followed precisely, for instance if you have a variant already prepared. But it is essential that the curriculum vitae be up-to-date, and that it include all items shown below.

Vital statistics: Name.
Address.

Date of first UR employment.

Education:

Formal--High School.
College.
Graduate School.

Informal--Special programs, workshops etc.

Work experience (list in time sequence, with earliest shown first). Identify supervisor for University of Rochester experience.

Professional Society memberships and activities.

Publications or special accomplishments.

Memberships and activities in University, community and other groups.

Special skills such as languages, computing etc.

Other special qualifications or interests.

State University of New York at Albany

Evaluation of Academic Deans and Directors

September 1, 1977

For the last two years there has been discussion in the Conference of Deans at Albany about the evaluation of the performance of academic deans. In a discussion paper of February, 1976, the deans suggested that formal procedures for the periodic evaluation of academic deans be developed. The deans noted that the Chancellor and campus presidents now undergo a review every five years, the faculty are evaluated somewhat regularly, and non-teaching professionals are evaluated annually against a performance program.

In addition to the proposal by the Conference of Deans concerning evaluation, the by-laws of the three new arts and sciences colleges call for an evaluation of deans in those units. One professional school has conducted an annual review of its dean for the past four years and a second professional school has recently initiated a review process. Other SUNY campuses have an evaluation process for deans.

A recent review of national research on the evaluation of administrators in Research Currents of the American Association of Higher Education indicated that "the immediate superior of the person being reviewed normally conducts the evaluation, with assistance from others" and that "all persons and constituencies with whom the person under review interacts, and who are thus knowledgeable about his or her performance, should be involved in the process." The article also states that the most common rationale for evaluating administrators includes the following:

°To identify needed areas of individual professional development and personal growth.

°To improve individual administrative performance.

°To help define more clearly individual objectives consistent with institutional missions and goals.

°To improve internal communications, administrative teamwork, and the overall management of the institution.

°To reward outstanding administrative performance.

°To validate the selection, retention, salary and promotion processes.

°To inventory personnel resources for reassignment or training.

°To help answer the external and internal demands for accountability.

Much of this generalrationale applies to the evaluation of academic deans and directors.

All deans at Albany are evaluated informally but it is an appropriate time to formally review the performance of academic deans and directors not otherwise reviewed. The next logical expansion of the process will be to include other managerial positions not now reviewed.

When President Fields approved the by-laws of the three new colleges in May 1977, he withheld approval of the section that included plans for evaluation of deans' performance until a campus-wide plan was formulated and initiated so that all the by-laws could be brought into conformity.

The campus-wide plan follows:

I. There shall be a regular review of the performance of the academic deans and of directors who are not otherwise regularly evaluated. The review shall occur near the end of the fourth year of service or at the beginning of the fifth year of service. Subsequent reviews should occur at not more than five year intervals.

II. The review shall be the responsibility of the vice president for academic affairs who shall report the outcome of the evaluation and make any recommendations stemming from that evaluation to the president.

III. The vice president shall consult with appropriate constituencies of the campus for their contribution to the evaluation. That consultation will take place primarily through an evaluation committee.

A. The committee shall consist of at least five persons, a majority of whom shall be tenured faculty from the college or school. In colleges or schools with departments, at least one of the committee members should be currently serving as a chairperson. Consideration will also be given to inclusion of non-teaching professionals, students, and/or external professionals as deemed appropriate.

B. The Vice President will ask the council of the college to designate the members of the Committee in consultation with the vice president. The vice president will issue letters of appointment to the committee indicating their designation by

Their council, after consultation with chairs and deans. 41

IV. Criteria for Evaluation

A. Academic Leadership

1. Contributions to the improvement of instructional and research programs.

2. Evidence of leadership in academic planning and development within the college or school.

B. Executive and Organizational Ability

1. Ability to organize and manage the office of the dean effectively and efficiently.

2. Ability to represent the needs, concerns, and interests of the college or school to the administration, to the University as a whole, and to the external community.

3. Ability to work effectively within an all-University context for the general purposes and goals of the university.

C. Personal Skills

1. Integrity and effectiveness in dealing with colleagues, students and other interested persons.

2. Accessibility.

3. Ability to deal with and mediate conflicts.

4. Evidence of continued professional development.

5. Evidence of community service and contributions.

V. Data to be Considered

A. The incumbent dean shall furnish the evaluation committee with an updated vita and, as its first item of consideration, a "self-study" enumerating and analyzing (1) major accomplishments during the period of incumbency; (2) major problems during the period of incumbency and an assessment of the reasons for them; (3) relative success in meeting academic goals; and (4) major problems and opportunities which should be addressed by the dean in the next several years. Ample opportunities should be provided for the incumbent to discuss the self-study with the committee.

B. The evaluation committee will draw upon annual reports, three-year plans and other written statements to assess the extent to which planned goals have been achieved under the leadership of the incumbent.

C. The evaluation committee shall systematically solicit data relative to the criteria for evaluation specified above from faculty, chairpersons, students and other appropriate individuals.

Either the evaluation committee or the vice president should consider soliciting data from other deans, vice presidents other than academic affairs, staff and where appropriate, community representatives and other external sources.

D. The evaluation committee shall submit to the vice president one copy of its report summarizing its findings. Another copy shall go to the council of the college. Included in the report will be a discrete summary of the views of each of the groups from whom data were solicited.

VI. Conclusion of Process

A. After receiving the report of the evaluation committee, the vice president will be responsible for (1) incorporating his own evaluation; (2) reviewing the findings and conclusions with the incumbent; and (3) formulating a recommendation to the President. The vice president shall forward the committee report along with his recommendation to the President.

B. After receiving all evaluations and the recommendation of the vice president, the president will consult with appropriate individuals or groups as needed.

VII. Evaluation of Process

Upon the completion of the evaluations to be undertaken during the first year, the vice president will consult with the faculty evaluation committees and others involved in the process to determine its effectiveness and possible modification for future years.

Because the constituencies involved in the evaluation process differ in the Library from those of an academic school or college, the following paragraphs should be substituted in the appropriate places.

III. A. The committee shall consist of at least seven persons, at least four of whom shall be tenured members of the Library faculty. At least one member of the committee should be currently holding responsibilities at the level of Assistant Director of Libraries. Consideration will also be given to inclusion of a non-teaching professional and/or a member of the classified service staff, a student, and/or external faculty as deemed appropriate.

B. The vice president will ask the Steering Committee of the Library faculty to designate the members of the committee in consultation with the vice president. After consultation with the Director's Council, the Director of Libraries and the Senate Library Council, the vice president will issue letters of appointment to the committee.

Any reference in the document to council of the college should read steering committee for the Library.

9/79

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

QUESTIONNAIRE - EVALUATION OF DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES

Please indicate your opinion of the performance of _____ *Director of University Libraries, by using the following scale:*

1 (POOR) 2 3 4 5 6 7 (EXCELLENT)

Please mark your rating in the space provided to the right of each criterion. If you feel that you do not have sufficient information to make a judgment on a particular criterion, please enter NK (no knowledge on which to base a response).

1. Contributions to the improvement of the University Libraries. ____
2. Contributions to the support of instructional and research programs. ____
3. Evidence of leadership in planning and development within the University Libraries. ____
4. Ability to organize and manage the office of the Director effectively and efficiently. ____
5. Ability to represent the needs, concerns, and interests of the University Libraries to the SUNYA administration, to the University community, and to the external community. ____
6. Ability to work effectively within an all-University context for the general purposes and goals of the University. ____
7. Integrity in dealing with colleagues, students, and other interested persons. ____
8. Accessibility. ____
9. Ability to deal with and mediate conflicts. ____
10. Effectiveness in dealing with colleagues, students, and other interested persons. ____
11. Evidence of continued professional development. ____
12. Evidence of community service and contributions. ____
13. Given your responses to the questions above and any other considerations, what is your overall evaluation? ____

12-16-77

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF THE DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES
AT THE
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY

1. Contributions to the improvement of the University Libraries.

2. Contributions to the support of instructional and research programs.

3. Evidence of leadership in planning and development within the University Libraries.

4. Ability to organize and manage the office of the Director effectively and efficiently.

5. Ability to represent the needs, concerns, and interests of the University Libraries to the SUNYA administration, to the University community, and to the external community.

6. Ability to work effectively within an all-University context for the general purposes and goals of the University.

7. Integrity in dealing with colleagues, students, and other interested persons.

8. Accessibility.

9. Ability to deal with and mediate conflicts.

10. Effectiveness in dealing with colleagues, students, and other interested persons.

11. Evidence of continued professional development.

12. Evidence of community service and contributions.

Southern Illinois
University at Carbondale
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

Morris Library

March 12, 1981

In response to your request for information regarding the evaluation of the library director (dean in our case), the enclosed Faculty Evaluation form is used for all library faculty. The Dean of Library Affairs is evaluated annually by the six professionals who report directly to him, as well as by the Library Affairs Faculty Executive Board and the Library Affairs Civil Service (support staff) Executive Board. Members of these two groups are elected from the respective groups as a whole.

The evaluation process includes the preparation of the form as well as individual discussions between Dean and evaluator.

Darrell L. Jenkins
Administrative Services Librarian

55

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AT CARBONDALE
LIBRARY AFFAIRS
Faculty Evaluation

On March 9, 1976, the Faculty Senate resolved "that each academic department develop its own specific procedures for evaluating teaching. . . (and) that the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research establish a standing committee of faculty to periodically monitor and evaluate the evaluation system." That committee is to be the Undergraduate Teaching and Curriculum Committee. Its criteria for judging evaluation systems are as follows:

1. The proposed evaluation system should include evaluation of the instructor by students, peers, and the Department Executive Officer.

2. The evaluation system should specify the frequency for evaluating individual teaching performance in any given year.

3. The proposed evaluation system should have the following characteristics:

   a. Its primary purpose should be for the improvement of instruction of each faculty member.

   b. It should include diagnostic components which provide information to the faculty member that could result in the improvement of instruction.

   c. It should provide the faculty member with information about her or his teaching effectiveness.

4. The proposed evaluation system should be acceptable to the Department, the Dean, and the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Research.

5. The proposed evaluation system should keep cost and time commitments within reason.

6. The proposed evaluation system should provide for periodic review to insure the system's continuing effectiveness.

Mindful of differences in the respective duties of teachers and librarians, the Library Affairs faculty wish to affirm their essential role in the instructional program of the University by participating in the evaluation of their activities which support that program. We propose several kinds of evaluation, recognizing that none is itself sufficient and that their usefulness and applicability will vary according to the function of the person evaluated. These should all be done annually, between December 1 and January 15. Evaluations of all kinds are to be communicated to the person evaluated, and all but that done by one's superior will then be subject to the control of the person evaluated. Evaluations of peers, including that on one's superior, are to be signed.

EVALUATION BY STUDENTS

Those members of the Library Affairs faculty who teach classes will be evaluated by their students. An instructor who teaches a formal course will use the Instructional Improvement Questionaire. One who teaches another's class will use either the Library Affairs Classroom Evaluation Form or one approved by his or her department.

EVALUATION BY PEERS

In this document all Library Affairs faculty are one another's peers. Prior to the evaluation period each faculty member will be requested by the Faculty Executive Board to submit names of faculty members from whom peer evaluations are desired. These persons would be the most qualified to evaluate the faculty member and may or may not be colleagues within the same department. There is no minimum or maximum number of peer evaluations required. Peer evaluations will then be solicited by the Faculty Executive Board on behalf of the faculty member being evaluated. These evaluations are communicated directly to the faculty member being evaluated by the evaluator.

EVALUATION BY DEPARTMENT EXECUTIVE OFFICERS

Because of the unique organization of Library Affairs, the requirement for evaluation by the Department Executive Officer can, in most cases, best be met by substituting evaluation by the department head. All members of the Library Affairs faculty will be evaluated by their department heads, who will discuss their evaluations with each person evaluated. Department heads will be evaluated by their Department Executive Officers who will in turn be evaluated by the Dean of Library Affairs.

OTHER EVALUATIONS

All members of the Library Affairs faculty may evaluate themselves in order to clarify their goals and objectives and to assess their progress toward them. These evaluations will be discussed with one's department head or other immediate superior.

The evaluation of Library Affairs faculty by their patrons is likely to be the least useful form of evaluation for two principal reasons. The most serious flaw is the shallow basis for evaluation provided by what is often a single, brief encounter of librarian and patron. Such an encounter compares neither in duration nor substance with that of a student and classroom teacher meeting two or three times a week for a semester. The other difficulty with patron evaluation is bias in its administration. If evaluation forms were simply made available to patrons, they would most likely be completed by the furious or the deeply grateful, neither of whom is very representative. If the librarian were to distribute them to patrons, he or she would be most inclined to do so following a successful attempt to help a patron and disinclined when unsuccessful. Because of these problems we have decided not to recommend evaluation by patrons.

None of the above precludes other evaluations which may be desired by an individual department or person.

PERIODIC REVIEW

The Faculty Executive Board will annually review this evaluation system and recommend any necessary improvements to the Library Affairs faculty.

SOUTHERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY AT CARBONDALE
LIBRARY AFFAIRS
Faculty Evaluation

Name _____ Date _____

Period covered _____ to _____

Department _____ Title _____

Please check the category of evaluation which applies and then read the instructions below.

_____ Department Head's, Department Executive Officer's, or the Dean's evaluation of faculty member
_____ Faculty member's evaluation of department head, DEO or Dean
_____ Other peer evaluation
_____ Self evaluation

INSTRUCTIONS FOR ALL CATEGORIES

1. Check appropriate response for each item.
2. Mark N/A beside those items which are not applicable to the position of the faculty being evaluated
3. Leave blank those items to which you cannot adequately respond.

A. Performance of Instructional Support Activities

1. Quality of work

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Accuracy; reliability; creativity; knowledge of professional and subject specialty; familiarity with university's programs; service to university community; understanding of operations and services of library or LRS and ability to interpret and integrate; skill in identifying patron/client needs.

Comments:

2. Attitude

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Cooperation with others to further the objectives of the department; willingness to fill in for colleagues when necessary; receptivity to constructive criticism and suggestions; consideration of others' ideas and alternative approaches to services and procedures; adaptability.

Comments:

3. Initiative

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Identifies problems and promotes their solutions; acceptance or assumption of responsibility; follow-up.

Comments:

4. Communication

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Communication with superiors, colleagues, staff and patrons; keeping informed about library policies, procedures, activities and aiding in the dissemination of information.

Comments:

5. Organization

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Setting priorities and accomplishing most important work first; effective application of policies and procedures in both individual and group situations.

Comments:

6. Administrative ability

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Comments:

Suggested points for consideration: Formulation of clearly recognized goals and objectives; anticipation and preparation for changing conditions; long-range planning; delegation of authority and responsibility when appropriate.

7. Decision-making

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Comments:

Suggested points for consideration: Soundness and consistency of judgment; appreciation of complexity; ability to re-think or modify decisions as circumstances change; ability to anticipate problems in order to facilitate decision-making.

8. Supervisory skills

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Comments:

Suggested points for consideration: Availability to counsel and assist; recognition and reward of meritorious achievement of subordinates; insight into problems encountered by subordinates in their work; honesty; dependability and fairness in dealings with subordinates; recognition and giving proper credit for subordinates' ideas and work; encouragement of subordinates to advance professionally.

9. Overall evaluation

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Comments:

B. Professional services activities

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Service on departmental, library, and university committees and special administrative assignments and tasks; consultation with, lectures, talks or tours to groups on matters involving professional or scholarly organizations (see P & T document, VII, 3)

Comments:

C. Research, creative, and other scholarly activities

_____ Excellent performance
_____ Exceeds position requirements
_____ Meets position requirements
_____ Substandard performance
_____ Unsatisfactory performance

Suggested points for consideration:
Formal publications (books, bibliographies, articles, etc.); papers presented to professional groups (see P & T document, VII, 2)

Comments:

D. Please comment on areas where improvement is needed and include suggestions for means of improvement.

E. Please comment on the faculty member's assets and areas where improvement has been since previous evaluation.

F. Department head, DEO or Dean's evaluation of faculty member only: please comment on whether goals from previous evaluation were achieved and in conjunction with faculty member being evaluated, specify goals for the coming year.

(signature of faculty member) (signature of evaluator)

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Library Professional Data Sheet *

ANNUAL

Texas A&M University Libraries

Name:_____
Last First Middle

Period covered:_____

Date of appointment:_____

Date of last promotion in rank:_____

Eligible for next promotion:_____

Date of coming tenure review:_____

Current academic rank:_____

Please complete this form giving all pertinent information concerning activities during the period covered. List activities from the most recent.

1. Scholarly pursuit.
   a. Publications

   b. Research projects

   c. Presentations

2. Professional activities
   a. Committee service, elective offices, other positions of responsibility (Include national, state, and regional organizations as well as university ans library activities).

*These data sheets are used for the library director, as well as for other library professionals.

b. Other professional activities (Include teaching assignments, professional consultancies, travel for professional growth, etc.).

c. Association memberships.

d. Attendance at professional meetings.

3. Continuing education
   a. Formal academic degrees completed or in progress.

   b. Other structured programs (Describe).

4. Other activities considered noteworthy.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Library Professional Data Sheet

Texas A&M University Libraries

Name: _____
Last First Middle

---

1. Academic preparation and continuing education. (Include, chronologically, degree, institution, year, major, other education)

2. Academic Rank (include dates)

3. Current assignment (Include statement of duties, personnel supervised, etc.)

4. Previous college or university positions and other professional employment, if applicable (include dates)

5. Publications, research projects, academic honors

6. Membership and positions on faculty committees and organizations. (List chronologically with dates)

7. Professional activities and responsibilities outside the University Libraries. (Include teaching assignments, professional consultancies, etc.)

8. Membership in professional organizations of state or national scope. (Include positions held, committee memberships, etc.)

9. Participation in student activities (advisement, sponsorship, etc.)

10. Attendance at professional meetings and other pertinent travel during employment at the Texas A&M University Libraries. (List chronologically)

11. Other activities. (Include membership in other organizations, community activities, etc.)

12. Goals and plans for future growth.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

TORONTO, ONTARIO, CANADA M5S 1A5

Cable Address: Libruniv, Toronto

March 16, 1981

Re: evaluation of library directors

The University's policy in this matter, as adopted July 1, 1978, specifies a term appointment of seven to ten years for future directors, and implies some sort of evaluation before a term is renewed but does not specify the nature of the review. Attached are clauses 57 and 66-71, of the Policy for Librarians,

You will note that Clause 71 exempts from term status those librarians who held senior administrative positions before July 1, 1978, and so exempts me since my present appointment dates from 1954.

RHB/md

R.H. Blackburn,
Chief Librarian

54. Librarians granted research leave may receive a portion of their salary while on leave in the form of a research grant, under the same terms and conditions as members of the teaching staff. Librarians granted study leave for work leading to a degree may, on the recommendation of the Chief Librarian, receive a portion of their salary while on leave as a fellowship.

55. If additional funds are received from other sources, the amount of salary is adjusted so that the total remuneration does not exceed 100 per cent of salary plus a reasonable amount for travel and research.

APPOINTMENT AND TENURE OF OFFICE OF SENIOR LIBRARY ADMINISTRATORS

56. The responsibility for recommending appointment of senior library administrators in the Library system (department heads, assistant and associate librarians within the Central Library, and librarians having comparable responsibilities outside the Central Library) rests with the Chief Librarian. For administrative appointments outside the Central Library, the Chief Librarian shall consult with the academic administrative head of the division in which the appointment is made.

57. All senior line administrative appointments in the Library system shall be for fixed terms, which shall be renewable without limit.

58. Staff officer appointments within the Central Library shall be made by the Chief Librarian on terms and conditions which he or she shall determine.

Consultative Committees

59. In recommending senior line administrative appointments, the Chief Librarian shall establish Consultative Committees which shall make recommendations to him or her regarding such appointments. These Committees shall consider for appointment all persons known to be available to fill the position through nominations and applications, using as

63. The term of appointment as a department head shall not exceed five years.

Senior Administrative Appointments

64. For more senior appointments than that of department head and other than that of the Chief Librarian of the University, the Consultative Committee shall be chaired by the Chief Librarian, and shall include one member of the teaching staff (from the division concerned if the appointment is outside the Central Library), one Associate Librarian or equivalent, one library department head or equivalent, four librarians, and three persons who are not librarians. The Committee shall be appointed by the Chief Librarian in consultation with the Vice-President and Provost, other academic administrative officers concerned, and senior colleagues, bearing in mind the need for broad representation along the lines prescribed for Consultative Committees charged with advising on the appointment of department heads. The provisions relating to confidentiality outlined for committees on the appointment of department heads shall apply with equal force to Consultative Committees established under this paragraph.

65. The term of appointment of line library administrative officers above the position of department head shall not exceed seven years.

The Chief Librarian

66. The appointment of the Chief Librarian of the University shall be recommended by the President on the advice of a search committee chaired by the Vice-President and Provost or his or her designate, with an additional twelve members, of whom no fewer than seven shall be appointed from within the Library system, and of whom no fewer than four shall be librarians in this University. The committee shall be appointed by the Vice-President and Provost and shall be as representative of the University community as is feasible.

67. The term of appointment of the Chief Librarian shall be that recommended by the President and approved by the Governing Council, which should not be less than seven nor more than ten years.

68. The formation and membership of the search committee for a Chief Librarian of the University shall be made widely known throughout the University.

Acting Appointments

69. Nothing in the foregoing shall be taken to preclude the appointment by the Chief Librarian of acting administrative officers for periods of not more than one year, nor the appointment by the President of an Acting Chief Librarian for such a period as he or she may recommend and the Governing Council approve.

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

70. All librarians who will have completed at least four years of full-time employment in the University on July 1, 1978, shall be deemed to have permanent status and shall receive confirmation in writing of this status. Librarians I and II who have been employed by the University for less than four years, and Librarians III and IV who have been employed by the University for less than one year shall be considered for permanent status as prescribed in these regulations.

71. Library administrators appointed prior to the adoption of this policy by the Governing Council shall not have their terms of office limited except at their own election, which may be made at any time.

72. This Report does not apply to part-time librarians (i.e., to those appointed at less than 75 per cent of full-time employment). Policies for part-time librarians should be developed which are compatible with the recommendations of this Report.

-Washington State University, Faculty Manual, October 1976 as updated to 1979.

PRINCIPAL ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

Principal Administrative Officers are the Deans of Academic Units, the Dean of the Graduate School, the Director of Libraries, the Registrar, the Director of Admissions, the Director of Systems and Computing, the Director of Intercollegiate Athletics, and others who may be appointed from time to time by the President.

Appointments to principal administrative positions are approved by the Board of Regents on recommendation of the President. When a vacancy in this group occurs, the President will normally appoint a special committee to seek out and recommend to him the best available candidates. Specific instructions may be given to such committee regarding special areas or special types of candidates to consider. The committee's recommendations are not binding, but they will be given careful consideration.

Administrative officers, as such, have no tenure in their positions. The service of members of this group is subject to review by the President at any time and to periodic formal review as outlined below. However, Washington State University desires continuity of competent service on the part of its Principal Administrative Officers.

Members of the faculty in administrative positions are expected to follow policies, procedures, and regulations pertinent to their administrative duties. They are expected to exercise sound judgment, to be willing to accept responsibility, to cooperate with other administrative units, to follow a broad concept of institutional interests and needs, and to provide leadership. They have general authority and responsibility for the administration of their respective areas. It is expected that goals and missions for programs will be developed in cooperation with units in the area and with appropriate University officers.

REVIEW OF ACADEMIC DEANS AND DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES

It is the policy of the University that a periodic review of the performance of each Academic Dean and of the Director of Libraries be carried out at five-year intervals of service. This performance review follows procedures which use, as a principal point of reference, the position description and the mission statements of the University and the major unit.

This review is conducted by an ad hoc committee, including faculty, department heads, students, experienced administrators of other units or from other institutions, and, where appropriate in terms of the duties of the dean, persons from outside the University representing constituencies to whom the officer has important responsibilities.

Specific guidelines for this review procedure are available from the Office of the Vice President Academic. The recommendations of the committee are transmitted as a confidential report to the President.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Procedures for Review of Academic Deans and Director of Libraries

Academic Deans and the Director of Libraries shall be appointed by the President and shall remain in their administrative office at the will of the President. They shall be reviewed according to the following procedure during each fifth year of service.

The review shall be undertaken by an ad hoc Review Committee.

For all Academic Deans (except Dean of Graduate School) and Director of Libraries, the Committee shall include:

(a) No fewer than five and no more than ten non-student members, selected as follows:

(1) Forty per cent (or the nearest number to forty per cent) shall be appointed by the Executive Vice President. These may include chairmen, representatives of other campus units, and persons outside the University whose interests impinge upon the interests of the unit of the administrator under review.

(2) Sixty per cent (or the nearest number to sixty per cent) shall be elected at large from the faculty of the administrative unit of the Dean or Director of Libraries. The process by which these members shall be elected shall be left to the decision of the faculty of the individual unit.

(b) Two students, one appointed by the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Association and the other appointed by the President the ASWSU.

For the Dean of the Graduate School, the Committee shall consist of:

(a) Ten non-student members. Four shall be appointed by the Executive Vice President, as above; two shall be elected by the faculty and exempt staff of the units responsible to the Dean of the Graduate School; two shall be appointed by the Graduate Studies Committee; and two shall be appointed by the Research and Arts Committee. The research units and the two committees shall individually determine the method to be followed in selecting their representatives.

(b) Two graduate students appointed by the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Association.

1980-81 procedures

Under revision

In carrying out its review, the Committee shall consult with those administrators who report directly to the administrator under review and with any other persons considered appropriate, including faculty of the unit involved and non-WSU personnel. It shall make use of a detailed statement of accomplishments since the previous review, to be provided by the administrator under review. It shall also consider all appropriate documentation relating to the area of the administrator under review, such as accreditation reports, graduate program reviews, and similar professional studies and analyses. All findings and recommendations of the Committee, including summaries of its interviews, shall be transmitted to the Vice President-Academic, with copies to the Dean or Director of Libraries. The administrator under review shall be given an opportunity to provide comments on the report to the Vice President-Academic.

The Vice President-Academic shall review the Committee findings and recommendations, together with the comments of the administrator under review, consulting with others as may be appropriate. In the case of the review of a Dean, this consultation may include discussions with the chairmen in the unit of the Dean under review, with the Dean of the Graduate School, and with appropriate administrators in other colleges and universities with which the unit of the Dean under review has programmatic or administrative links. In the case of the review of the Dean of the Graduate School, this consultation may include discussions with the other Academic Deans. In the case of the Director of Libraries, this consultation may involve discussions with the Academic Deans, including the Dean of the Graduate School. The report of findings and recommendations from the Committee shall be transmitted to the President, together with a summary of findings and recommendations made by the Vice President-Academic.

The Review Committee's report will be treated in the same manner as a search committee's recommendation in hiring a dean. The President "is not bound by the Committee's report, but will give it careful consideration." Faculty Manual, p. 10, 1971 edition.

SUNY ALBANY

1979

PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF LIBRARY DIRECTORS

by
Marion P. Munzer
Associate Librarian
State University of New York at Albany

A survey of ARL libraries centered on formal, periodic evaluation of the chief library administrative officer. Included in the survey were questions regarding criteria used in the evaluation process, who the participants are, methodology used, and use of results. Additional information obtained from the survey deals with the Director's type of appointment, comparison with other administrative positions in the university, and employment possibilities available to those who leave the Director position. The survey shows that evaluation of Directors is increasing and that the position of Director of Libraries is comparable to that of Deans or other Directors: no other pattern emerges and the conclusion is that a variety of methods of accountability exists.

12 pages
6 tables
Appendix

PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS OF LIBRARY DIRECTORS

Administrator evaluation, a part of the accountability movement in education, is receiving increased attention.[1] While evaluation of university faculty members has long been accepted, it was not until the mid 70's that formal evaluation was extended to include the president of the university.[2] The most recent addition is of deans and directors;[3] directors of libraries, since they are the chief administrative library officers, are being included in these detailed, formal, periodic evaluations of university administrators.

In the Association of Research Libraries, evaluation of the library director is becoming more prevalent, with the greater percentage of evaluations having been instituted within recent years. This is one of the findings of a survey which was begun in the spring of 1978.

The survey, in questionnaire form, was sent to the ninety-four university libraries which were members at that time of the Association of Research Libraries. Follow-up mailings were sent, and by April of 1979 eighty-one responses were received.

The questionnaire was designed to ascertain the prevalence of formal, periodic evaluations, what criteria are used, who participates, how the evaluation is conducted, how results are used. Other information requested dealt with the type of appointment, comparisons with other administrative positions, and employment possibilities available to a former Director. (See APPENDIX for a copy of the questionnaire.)

The following report on the findings of that questionnaire is presented as a means of providing information on what is being done in the field of evaluation of library directors. For those institutions which have completed their philosophical discussions and are about to undertake such a review, this report may serve as a listing of options within the specific aspects of the evaluation process.

PREVALENCE OF PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

How prevalent is formal, periodic evaluation of university library directors?[4] The responses to the questionnaire show an even division between those libraries which do conduct evaluations (38) and those which do not (38). This 50/50 division is not the total picture, however, since the five remaining respondents (out of the 81 who answered

the quiry) state that such evaluations may be instituted. Furthermore, out of the thirty-eight libraries which do not have periodic evaluations of their directors, thirteen libraries do have an informal review of the performance of their chief administrative officer. Percentage-wise, this works out to 53% of the responding ARL university libraries conducting, or considering conducting, evaluations of their Library Director, and to 81% having some type of performance evaluation.

Instituting Director evaluations is fairly recent among the libraries surveyed. Twenty-three (60%) of the thirty-eight libraries which conduct periodic reviews have been doing it for five years or less; twenty-seven (71%) have been doing it for ten years or less. (See TABLE 1 for detailed statistics on the length of time periodic evaluations have been in effect in these thirty-eight libraries)

In eleven libraries the practice of evaluating the Director has been in effect for many years. Two libraries report that they have had the practice for fifteen years. On the remaining eight campuses the practice is so established that the length of time it has been carried out is stated to be "Always" or "For as long as memory"; on six campuses there is not so accurate a memory and so the response given was "Unknown".

TIMING OF THE EVALUATION (TABLE 2)

Of the 38 library directors in universities which have formal evaluations, twenty directors are evaluated every year. Some of these evaluations, like those which are conducted informally, are made in conjunction with the budget process and the annual salary adjustments.

On thirteen campuses, the evaluation takes place after the Director has been in office for five years.

The longest length of service before evaluation is eight years.

On another campus, where the appointment is made for seven years, the review is conducted in the sixth year.

Two libraries responded that they evaluate their Director after four years.

In one library, the practice is to evaluate the Director after three years for those individuals holding a continuous academic appointment, and after five years for those not holding one.

TABLE 1

Length of Time Periodic Evaluations Have Been in Effect

Length of Time	Number of Libraries
"As long as memory"	1
"Always"	1
"Several years"	1
Unknown	6
15 years	2
10 years	1
8 years	1
7 years	1
6 years	1
5 years	5
4 years	3
3 years	5
2 years	5
1 year	5

TABLE 2

Director's Period of Service
Before Being Evaluated

Length of Service	Number of Libraries
1 year (evaluation is annually)	20
5 years	13
4 years	2
8 years	1
7 years	1
Varies according to appointment	1

Institutions which reported an informal evaluation practice indicated that evaluation occurs frequently: "on an almost daily basis", "continuously", "on-going".

CRITERIA: ITS DETERMINATION (TABLE 3)

Criteria against which the Director is evaluated is determined, in fifteen cases, by an individual: the President, the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Provost. In an additional five cases, this senior officer consults with someone else, usually that person's superior officer; in three other cases the senior officer consults with the members of a committee.

Committees, either working independently or in consultation with a senior officer, determine the criteria on thirteen campuses. Some of these committees are established ones (Board of Trustees, University Senate); in five instances they are special review committees.

On three campuses the criteria is established by "the University"; on one, each faculty develops its own procedures and criteria.

Mention of involvement of the library faculty in establishing criteria for the evaluation of the Director was made in three responses.

The criteria used in evaluating the Director of libraries is the same as that applied to deans and directors on eighteen campuses. On three other campuses, the same criteria conceptually is used, with modification for unique library functions.

On two campuses each academic unit determines its own criteria: on one of these campuses the unit designs its own forms and procedures which are reviewed by a University-wide committee.

Seven libraries responded that they use special criteria for evaluating the Director; nine stated that the criteria was not specified or was not known.

TABLE 3

Criteria Determination: Responsible Individual or Group

Responsible Individual or Group	Number of Libraries
University official (e.g., President)	15
University official in consultation with other individuals	5
University official in consultation with a committee	3
Established university group	3
Established university group together with others	2
Special review group	4
Special review group in consultation with others	1
University	3
Each faculty	1
Do not know	1

EVALUATION PROCESS: WHO CONDUCTS IT

Evaluation is carried out by the administrative officer (President, Provost, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs) in twenty-four libraries, while in eleven libraries a council group or committee is involved.

In two instances the evaluative group consists of all professional librarians. In the eight cases where the composition of the evaluating committee was clearly described, all had librarians.

Members of the evaluating committee may be appointed, appointed upon recommendation, elected, or a combination of these.

Of the 37 libraries which stated where ultimate responsibility lies for the evaluation of the Director, 34 stated it was with a university administrative officer (President, Chancellor, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Provost). "The Board" was responsible on one campus, Library Faculty Council on a second and, in the third instance, the Executive Committee of the Libraries faculty.

EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Procedures for conducting the evaluation are written on eighteen campuses; an equal number of campuses do not have written procedures. The evaluation procedure is formal on twenty, informal on twelve, both formal and informal on two and not specified on three.

EVALUATORS: WHO IS INVOLVED

Out of twenty-eight responses to the question regarding what individuals and groups are contacted for their opinions of the Director, eleven indicated that information is solicited from the constituencies affected by the Director: the library staff, students, faculty, other administrators. In two cases, only the person to whom the Director reports is consulted. On four campuses, people outside the university are contacted. On four other campuses, the matter of whom to consult is left to the discretion of the evaluating committee.

Involvement of the library staff (meaning personnel in both professional and clerical positions) occurs on thirteen campuses. On seven of these thirteen campuses, the only evaluation was by the library staff: on three campuses by the professional staff, and on the remaining four campuses in a variety of ways: by all high level librarians plus division heads and assistant directors, senior faculty and some library staff members, "each administrative officer who reports to him/her", library's classified staff and faculty.

METHODOLOGY (TABLE 4)

The methodology for obtaining comments on the Director's performance was varied: standard form, letters, interviews, questionnaires, hearings, private consultations, self-evaluations. In two out of the twenty-eight respondents, the choice of method to use is left to the discretion of the committee. Written evaluations were used in twelve cases, a questionnaire was the sole instrument used on three campuses, and on three other campuses the questionnaire was part of the means of obtaining information. Interviews were used in nine instances as part of the information gathering, and self-evaluations were submitted by four directors.

Comments were made anonymously in eight out of twenty-three cases, identified in eight cases, a combination in five, and in two cases left to the discretion of the evaluating committee.

LEGAL SAFEGUARDS

The question about what legal safeguards are taken received fifteen responses. The "usual confidentiality practiced in relation to personnel matters" was relied upon in six cases, while six other libraries stated they do not have any legal safeguards. Two cited the normal grievance procedure as being depended upon; one stated that the grievance policy requires written minutes and permits legal counsel, requires a legal advisor at all meetings, convenient times for meetings, and prompt scheduling.

TABLE 4

Evaluation Methods Used, Singly or in Combination

Method	Number of Libraries (28 replies)
Written evaluation only	2
Written evaluation combined with other methods	12
Evaluation form	1
Letter	2
Questionnaire only	3
Questionnaire combined with other methods	3
Interviews combined with other methods	9
Self-evaluation	4
Methodology determined by committee	2

FINAL REPORT ON THE EVALUATON

The final evaluation report was written in ten out of twenty-nine cases, oral in eleven, and a combination of oral and written in eight cases.

The form of the final report is left up to the decision of the evaluating committee on two campuses. Four universities do not have established procedures. A summary of relevant points is made in eleven out of twenty-four cases.

The individuals making the evaluation are not identified in eighteen cases, although in two cases they are.

The report includes recommendations in eleven out of twenty-two cases, but does not in eight cases, may or may not in two cases, and in one case is left to the discretion of the committee.

Out of twenty-four cases, in sixteen there is a discussion between the Director and the Vice President for Academic Affairs (or the equivalent of that position), in one case the report is sent to the Director who may then request a conference, while in one case the Director has never been informed of the results. Two mentioned that the action taken is not made public; two reported that a summary of the report is made available (one reported that the summary is shared with the university's administrative committee for information purposes only). On one campus the report is maintained in confidential personnel files; on another campus there are no established procedures.

USE OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation is used in fifteen out of twenty-four cases to determine whether the Director should be retained. Fourteen respondents mentioned its use in career development: areas of success are pointed out and also areas of needed improvement. One respondent mentioned that the evaluation is beneficial

"in providing feedback", and two stated that the evaluation is used in formulating objectives and determining "where the library should be going." In ten cases, the evaluation affects salary decisions.

OPTIONS OF THE DIRECTOR (TABLE 5)

What possibilities are open to the Director if, as a result of an unfavorable evaluation, he/she does not continue as Director? Replies to this question were received from 38 libraries which conduct a formal evaluation of the Director, and from 27 libraries which do not. "Continue" (in the same institution) was the reply given most often by both the evaluating and non-evaluating groups. The possibilities stated were to "revert to a lesser position in the library", or to teach (either in the library school or in a subject area). One replied that the Director has the same option as any Dean: in other words, to take a position in the library as a member of the library faculty. Tenure is a factor here: five directors who are formally evaluated could continue on in their institutions, while eight directors from the non-evaluating universities could remain in the library or have a teaching position.

"Leave" was given by three out of the 38 evaluating institutions: this same possibility was cited by four out of the 27 non-evaluating libraries. "Leave as an option" was cited in nine of the first group, five of the second.

"Negotiate" was stated as being a possibility in two libraries of each group, while one of the evaluating and two of the non-evaluating libraries stated that the appeal can be made under university grievance procedures. Directors have no specific retreat rights, and therefore cannot grieve, on two of the evaluating campuses and one of the non-evaluating campuses.

The possibilities are not known on six of the evaluating campuses, on three of the non-evaluating campuses. This is because they have not been determined as yet, are not spelled out, or no cases have occured.

TABLE 5

Possibilities Open to Director Who Does Not Continue in That Position

Possibility	In Library Which Has Formal Evaluation (38 replies)	In Library Which Does Not Have Formal Evaluation (27 replies)
Continue at the same institution, either in the library or as a member of the teaching faculty	19	17
Continue (as above) because of tenure	5	8
Leave (as only possibility)	3	4
Leave (as one option)	9	5
Negotiate	2	2
Appeal	1	2
No specific retreat rights	2	1
No appeal procedure	3	
Not known, not yet determined, nc cases	6	3
Varies	2	1

Note: Some replies indicated more than one possibility and therefore are counted more than once.

Two respondents stated that the possibilities vary: because of the length of service, because of qualifications and desires. Another respondent, this one from a library which does not have formal evaluation of its Director, stated that the possibilities would depend upon circumstances.

TYPE OF APPOINTMENT (TABLE 6)

The type of appointment which directors have shows as varied a pattern as was found in responses to other sections of the questionnaire. From some replies it is evident that the Director has a clearly-defined appointment, but from there on the range is all the way to "Unspecified."

In institutions which evaluate the Library Director, eleven out of thirty-eight appoint the Director to an academic or faculty position, seven to an administrative or management position, and six to a dual appointment of faculty/administrative. The remaining fourteen had ambiguous replies (except for the clearly-stated "Unspecified"), although from the evidence provided by other answers to the questionnaire it can be deduced that three directors, in addition to the above eleven, have academic appointments.

While not all respondents indicated whether the Director has tenure (either in the appointment as Director or as a member of the faculty) twenty-one out of the thirty-eight stated that the Director already has tenure or is eligible for tenure. Ten directors have term appointments or are in a non-tenured position, while three have an administrative/management appointment and "serve at the pleasure" of the university.

In the forty-one institutions which do not conduct a formal evaluation of the Director, sixteen directors have academic or faculty appointments, fifteen have administrative or management appointments, eight have joint faculty/administrative appointments, and two responses did not specify the type of appointment.

TABLE 6

Director's Type of Appointment

Type of Appointment	In Library Which Has Formal Evaluation (38 replies)	In Library Which Does Not Have Formal Evaluation (41 replies)
Faculty (Academic)	11	16
Tenured	5	12
Not tenured	2	2
Tenured as faculty, term as Director	4	1
Administrative (Management)	7	15
Continuing appointment	1	
Not tenured	1	4
Indefinite or "at pleasure"	3	5
Faculty/Administrative	6	8
Tenured as academic, term as administrative	4	
Not tenured; term appointment	1	
Presumed to be permanent		1
Unspecified type of appointment	14	2
Term appointment	6	
Tenurable	2	
Tenurable as librarian/academic, term as Director	5	2

Note: Some replies are counted in both the main type of appointment and (where stated) in the break-down of the category.

Tenure in this "not evaluated" group is already held by, or can be held by, sixteen directors, while six have term appointments, five serve at the pleasure of the university, and three have appointments which were not identified.

COMPARISON OF DIRECTOR'S WITH OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE POSITIONS

Answers to the entire questionnaire were scanned in order to determine how the position of the Library Director compares with that of other administrative officers. (The only question which dealt directly with comparisons was the one on criteria: Is the criteria the same as that used in evaluating other deans and directors or is there a special criteria for the Library Director?)

Out of the forty-nine replies which contain any information on this topic, forty-four show that evaluation of the Library Director is part of a wider accountability program.

In some universities, evaluations are conducted of all administrators, including the president and vice presidents. The Director of Libraries is evaluated, in general, in the same manner as deans and other directors, with application of the same regulations regarding criteria and procedures.

While 60% of the replies indicate that the Director is treated in the same way as are other directors and deans, at least in the matter of using the same criteria in the evaluation process, responses to other questions give a clearer picture of the Director's position. For example, one respondent stated that "the same evaluation format as is applicable to all in the Management Program is followed". Other responses were that the procedure for academic deans and department heads is followed; all administrators are evaluated once a year by their immediate superiors; contracts are the same for all management positions; procedures are the same as for other deans; chairmen and deans (and the Director) are evaluated; regulations for evaluation of administrative officers are the same;

formal university-wide evaluation of faculty and administrators is in effect; the Director's position is the same as deans' in length of appointment, timing of evaluation, and retreat rights; the same criteria is used but the Director has an indefinite term while deans are on a five-year terminal appointment.

An exception in the evaluation of administrators is made on one campus; while that university is moving towards term appointments and periodic review of administrators, the policy is aimed at Deans, Directors, etc., who come from teaching faculty ranks and can retreat. The President of that campus has observed that the program won't apply as well to "career" administrators - and the Director of Libraries expects that he is considered to be a "career" administrator.

COMMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS

Opinions favoring evaluation ranged from supporting informal procedures to statements that evaluations "would be much better if more formal."

Variations in the procedures between units on a single campus were cited as being "good administrative practice because it permits - indeed, encourages - an individual academic unit to do its own thing and allows maximum autonomy to individual academic units." On the other hand, other institutions support uniformity: either in criteria or in application of evaluation to all levels of administration (President, Vice-Presidents, Deans).

Comments on reasons for having formal evaluations ranged from institutional policy to individual practice. While some institutions are assessing performance on a wide range, one reply stated that "the decision of whether or not to conduct reviews is closely related to the style of the chief campus officer."

This individual basis turned up in another reply, this time with the individual being the person evaluated: evaluations are instituted "only when the Vice President must take action to relieve a dean of office."

Contrasted with this is the statement of one director: "Evaluation was requested by the incumbent because he felt that, considering the size of this partiular library operation, he was underpaid compared to some other chief librarians ... The result of the evaluation was gratifying to the incumbent."

Support for evaluation cited the importance to the Director of receiving information on job effectiveness: "It is a useful communications device", "the Director of Libraries receives a good sense of his performance."

A strong comment against evaluation was as follows: "I think we can spend too much time and effort on evaluative methods; establish too many criteria for evaluation; assemble too much paper and too many opinions. All these efforts may tend to divert the Director from his real job."

CONCLUSION

The outstanding fact to be gained from analyzing the responses to the questionnaire is that there are multiple ways of conducting a performance evaluation of the Director of Libraries. This conclusion applies to all aspects of the evaluation: criteria, methodology, groups submitting opinions and information, use made of the evaluation. The multiple approaches would indicate that each university designed its evaluation process in accordance with its own individual needs and concepts.

The second conclusion which may be drawn from this survey of members of the Association of Research Libraries is that, in a high percentage of these institutions, the position of Director of Libraries is considered to be comparable with Deans and Directors as evidenced by similar treatment in the evaluation process and in retreat rights.

Finally, the conclusion may be drawn that evaluation of Library Directors is being instituted at an increasing number of libraries.

References

1. John A. Shtogen, compiler, Administrative Development in Higher Education. The State of the Art: Volume 1. (Richmond, Virginia: Higher Education Leadership and Management Society, c1978), p.2.

2. Elizabeth C. Fisk and Richard C. Richardson, Jr., "Presidential Evaluation: The State of the Art," Liberal Education 65:341-55 (Fall 1979).

3. "Evaluating the Academic Dean," New Directions for Higher Education 6:51-58 (1978).

4. The term "Director" was used throughout the questionnaire although it was recognized that some campuses use a different term to designate the chief administrative library officer. In this report "Director" will continue to be used.

THE UNIVERSITY AT ALBANY

EVALUATION OF THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE LIBRARY

SURVEY

The attached questionnaire is designed to obtain information on the practices of universities in regard to the periodic evaluation of the chief administrator of the library. It is being sent to those universities which are members of the Association of Research Libraries, and since this is a limited group, each completed questionnaire will contribute greatly to the result.

This follow-up mailing of this questionnaire is being sent to those who did not respond to the earlier mailing (or perhaps did not receive it).

The results of this survey will be shared with other libraries who request it, and with the office of the Association of Research Libraries. (Please indicate below if you would like to receive a summary of the results.)

The questionnaire should be returned in the enclosed self-addressed envelope. It would be appreciated if the reply is received by April 1, 1979.

Marion P. Munzer

Marion P. Munzer
Associate Librarian

____ Check if you wish to receive a summary of the results of this survey.

____ Check if you are enclosing copies of documents used in your evaluation process.

Person completing this questionnaire _____

Position _____

Library _____

Address _____

_____

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY • 1400 WASHINGTON AVENUE • ALBANY, NEW YORK 12222

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE ON PERIODIC EVALUATION OF THE CHIEF

ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE LIBRARY

(The term "Director" is used throughout this questionnaire although it is recognized that some campuses use the term "Dean" or "Librarian" for the chief administrative officer of the library.)

If there is any information which you wish to have kept confidential and not released for publication, please circle that particular answer.

All participants are asked to answer question 1.

1. DIRECTOR

a. What type of appointment does the Director have? (For example, academic tenured, dual appointment to faculty and administration, term) _____

_____

b. Is the Director evaluated at periodic intervals? _____ Yes; _____ No.

c. If the Director is not evaluated periodically, was the evaluation discontinued, or is consideration being given to instituting periodic evaluation? ____ Discontinued; _____ May be instituted.

d. What possibilities are open to the Director, either as a result of the evaluation or own choice, if he/she does not continue as Director? _____

_____

_____

_____

2. EVALUATION PROCESS

a. How many years has the practice of periodic evaluation been in effect? ____years.

b. After what period of service is the Director evaluated? _____ years.

3. CRITERIA

a. Who determines the criteria to be used in the evaluation process? (For example, a university council, same as for faculty or academic positions) _____

_____

_____

_____

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK AT ALBANY • 1400 WASHINGTON AVENUE • ALBANY, NEW YORK 12222

3. CRITERIA (continued)

b. Is the criteria the same as that used in evaluating other deans and directors, or is there a special criteria for the Library Director? _____ Same criteria; _____ Special criteria.

4. RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION

a. Who is ultimately responsible for the evaluation of the Director? (For example, university president, library council) _____

b. Who carries out the evaluation? (For example, the administrative officer to whom the Director reports, a special committee) _____

_____

c. If the evaluation is carried out by a group, what is the composition of the group? _____

_____

_____

_____

d. Are the members of the evaluation group appointed or elected? _____ Appointed; _____ Elected; _____ Combination of appointed and elected.

e. By whom are the members of the evaluation group appointed or elected? _____

_____

_____

_____

5. METHODOLOGY

a. Are there established written procedures for the evaluation of the Director? _____ Yes; _____ No.

b. Is the evaluation conducted on a formal or informal basis? _____ Formal; _____ Informal.

c. What individuals or groups are contacted for opinions concerning the Director?

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. METHODOLOGY (continued)

d. What methods are used for gathering information? (For example, questionnaires, letters, hearings) _____

_____

_____

_____

e. Are the comments which are submitted to the evaluators made anonymously or identified? _____ Anonymous; _____ Identified; _____ Combination of anonymous and identified.

f. What legal safeguards are taken? (For example, legal counsel is obtained, minutes are maintained) _____

_____

_____

6. FINAL REPORT

a. Is the final report written or oral? _____ Written; _____ Oral; _____ Combination of written and oral.

b. How are the comments presented in the final report? (For example, opinions are listed by the items in the criteria, a summary is made by the various groups consulted) _____

_____

_____

_____

c. Are individuals who made comments identified in the final report? _____ Yes;

_____ No.

d. Does the final report include a recommendation in addition to the evaluation?

_____ Yes; _____ No.

e. What action is taken on the report? (For example, discussed with the Director, made public) _____

_____

_____

_____

6. FINAL REPORT (continued)

f. What use is made of the evaluation? (For example, identify areas of success or needed improvement, validate retention of the Director or salary increase)

7. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

CHAPTER NINE
FIRST AND LAST
THOUGHTS:
SUMMARY AND
CONCLUSIONS

Reproduced
with permission from
Presidential Assessment: A Challenge to College and University Leadership, by John W. Nason © Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

Evaluation as a public exercise is a relatively recent development. As a result there is no clearly established pattern of procedure. Indeed, any reader of the preceding chapters can hardly be blamed for feeling bewildered by the wide range of options. It may be useful, therefore, to emphasize the main issues discussed up to this point and to provide a summary for the reader interested in a concise overview of this complex issue.

THE HIGHLIGHTS OF ASSESSMENT

1. The performance of college and university presidents always has been and always will be judged. This is a fact of life which is the consequence of the sensitive and influential role which presidents play. The issue is not whether presidents will be evaluated, but how they will be evaluated and by whom. The past decade has seen a pronounced trend toward more formal assessments. Both the causes and the extent of this trend are examined in Chapter 1.

2. The choice of procedures should be dictated by the purpose or purposes that the board hopes to achieve by the evaluation. The more significant purposes are to fulfill trustee responsibility for making certain that the institution is well managed, to help the president improve his or her performance, to review and improve institutional governance, and to make certain that sound institutional goals are being pursued. Less important purposes—by-products, as it were, of the major ones—are to educate trustees and the academic community to the complexities of the president's job, to decide whether to retain or to fire the president, to set an example for the evaluation of administrative officers and faculty, and to determine the president's compensation.

Procedures may range from the completely casual to the highly structured. They may be virtually continuous, intermittent or scheduled for regular intervals. Although there is no clear dividing line, evaluations, beyond the traditional, regular and highly desirable interaction between board members and the chief executive officer, fall into two general classes—the informal and the formal.

Informal assessments tend to be frequent, say once a year, and are usually made by the trustees either on the basis of their first-hand knowledge of the president or on that knowledge plus impressions informally acquired from faculty, administrative officers, alumni and students. The assessment is a private and confidential affair between the trustees and the president.

Formal evaluations, on the other hand, are always characterized by three features. They occur—except, perhaps, for the first time—at regularly scheduled intervals. These may be once a year, but in the majority of cases they fall every three, four or five years. In contrast to the informal, almost hearsay, practice of learning what others think, formal assessments involve an organized and systematic effort to get "objective evidence" in terms of what other constituencies think about the president's performance. Finally, formal evaluations are public events. They are known by faculty and students, state officials and often the general public, to be taking place. This can be disastrous or constructive, depending on the political climate both within and surrounding the institution and the skill with which the evaluation is conducted. For a more thorough comparison of informal and formal procedures see Chapters 2 and 3.

3. Chapter 3 explores the advantages and disadvantages of both formal and informal evaluations. Formal assessments, when properly conducted, can achieve seven of the eight purposes of the operation. They throw a spotlight on the governing structure of the college or university—the role and performance of the board, the adequacy of the administrative team, the authority of the faculty, the influence of the central office of a statewide system in addition to the actions and influence of the president. They provide an orderly and public way of reviewing the goals of the institution and of the president's success in steering the institution toward these goals. They can strengthen the president's position by defusing sporadic attacks, by enhancing his or her credibility and by creating a better understanding of the president's job. They help trustees and regents to recognize their role and responsibilities.

The critics of formal assessments focus on their disadvantages—or at least their alleged disadvantages. It is argued that the president holds a unique position in the academic scheme of things and that his or her authority and prestige, the capacity to lead, would be undermined by public examination. It is further argued that modern problems and conditions have tended to make the president's role more political than educational and that formal evaluations would simply complete the politicization of the office. Presidents would be under pressure to decide issues on grounds of popularity rather than on what would be best for the institution. Since public scrutiny and criticism are always uncomfortable, presidents will sometimes resign rather than endure formal evaluations or, having survived the ordeal, will at once look around for some other place. In either case the result is shortened tenure in office. And finally, it is alleged, periodic formal evaluations are cop-outs. They are a device by which boards evade their proper responsibility for constant monitoring of the president's performance by passing the buck to others.

4. The advocates of informal procedures point out that such assessments keep the trustees in control as they should be. Since they are conducted in a quiet, behind-the-scenes manner, they do not tend to become major issues dividing faculty and others along "party lines." They take into account the very special relation between the president and the governing board, a relation of mutual interdependence

which is jeopardized by the atmosphere of public investigation. The ideal situation is one in which trustees and president work together with complete understanding and trust, where the assessment of the president's performance is continuous and where the president can turn to the board at any time for advice and assistance.

Except for the ideal situation just described, informal assessments, according to the critics, tend to be too casual—more pretense than substance. They are haphazard in that no systematic attempt is made to discover how the various constituencies react to the president. The criteria for judgment are rarely stated. They leave the president in an exposed position, subject to constant or intermittent attacks, particularly when some decision or incident has aroused violent opposition. Nor do they normally pay much attention to the major objectives of evaluation, such as the pattern of governance and the institutional goals.

5. The attitude of the board will determine the nature of the assessment. Some trustees are reluctant to do more than the bare minimum either because they believe anything more would spoil the beautiful relation between the president and themselves or because, having spent so much time and effort in selecting the president, they are reluctant to take any action that would force them to face the possibility of having to do it all over again. Indeed, many would like to help, but do not know how, or feel that they would be intruding upon the president in order to gain essential knowledge. These board members currently despair at simultaneously helping their own situation and helping the president.

For a successful assessment there needs to be a conscious intent to evaluate. The nature of the process will reflect both the interest of the board, the type and complexity of the institution and the temper of the campus. Whatever the process, it must begin with a board decision and remain under board control. Faculty, students and others may participate by consultation in presenting opinions; they should not be the major source of the ultimate evaluation. These issues are discussed in Chapter 4.

6. The purpose of the assessment should be, at its core, to help the president to improve his or her performance in office and in broader terms to improve the institution. This latter involves a critical look at board performance. Since the president is hedged about by faculty prerogatives as well as board authority, since his or her powers are limited by the competence of the other administrative officers and by central authority where the institution is part of a system, it is essential to review governance as a whole and not just the performance of the president. Furthermore, as already pointed out, performance needs to be seen in the light of institutional needs and goals which in turn may need to be reassessed and restated. From the president's point of view this takes the focus off his or her performance narrowly construed and helps the whole community to understand better the matrix of forces and inhibitions that compose the mosaic of academic governance.

7. Chapter 6 explores the need for and choice of criteria by which judgment is made. The president's responsibilities may be stated in the bylaws or handbook. They may be specified at the time of appointment or, all too often, sometime after appointment. They may be proposed by the president at the time an evaluation is being planned. Clearly the president should know on what standards he or she is being appraised, and it is highly desirable that these standards be agreed upon well in advance. Since different constituencies have different and often conflicting expectations from the president, it is important to get the criteria out into the open. Faculty may want a scholar; students, a hail-fellow-well-met and sports lover. If the trustees want a tough manager of a tightly run ship and a good fund raiser, the president may have to disappoint faculty and students, for the president is responsible to the trustees who set the demands. The normal range of criteria is to be found in Chapter 6.

8. Any formal evaluation and all but the most casual informal ones should begin with a self-assessment by the president or statement of stewardship. Where criteria of performance have not already been set, the president should be given the opportunity of saying what he or she considers to have been the major responsibilities of the office and how he or she has met them. This can be useful to the president who often has little time for stock taking, and useful to the trustees who get a fresh interpretation by the president of institutional needs and goals. There is also a real psychological benefit to the president who can beat his or her critics to the punch, as it were, by pointing out faults or failures. It is heartening to be able to grasp the initiative and indicate areas where improvement is desired and specifically addressed. In a situation of considerable personal strain and constant public pressure it is a comfort to confess certain weaknesses, along with successes of course, before one's critics blow them out of proportion. See Chapter 7.

9. No man is an island unto himself, especially not the college or university president. He or she works daily with a wide variety of people—administrative officers, faculty, system executives, students, alumni, public officials, donors, parents. How the president gets along with these groups is one aspect of evaluation. The trustees, therefore, need to know how members of these groups react to the president. Some know from firsthand, intimate, continuing contacts. Some pick up misinformation and partial information through rumors, hearsay and random conversations. Surely it is better, so runs the argument, to get accurate information through systematic inquiry. But then the danger confronts us, how to avoid all the absurdities of a popularity poll? Few presidents are heroes to

their faculties, and it is no coincidence that the colleges with excessive faculty control over policies have often suffered higher than normal presidential turnover.

Decisions must be made by the trustees about whom to consult. Should it be all the faculty or selected representatives, all administrative staff or only those who work most closely with the president, all students or those with some knowledge of the president? Both inclusive and selective methods have been tried, and such evidence as we have favors the latter. How should opinions be obtained—through questionnaires or by interviews? Again both methods have been used and sometimes a combination of the two. Interviews may be more time-consuming, but they make it easier for the evaluation committee to keep control, they minimize the publicity, and they make it possible to explore issues in much greater depth. The problems of techniques are discussed in Chapter 8.

10. There is no consensus on how often evaluations should be made. Some boards prefer annual assessments; others lean toward less frequent dates. There is some evidence that more frequent assessments tend to be perfunctory; but those who favor evaluations at four- and five-year intervals also want some kind of informal annual assessment.

There is, however, substantial agreement that the period of assessment should be quite limited. A few institutions have experimented with procedures stretching over a year and even longer, but the trend is toward limiting the period of investigation to two to four months. A longer time tends to make everyone upset and uncertain. Even the president who feels fairly confident experiences some anxiety while the evaluation is going on. The shorter and more quickly over, the better for all concerned.

11. The issue of openness versus confidentiality needs careful management. Both are important, and except for extreme situations they need not conflict. Individual judgments should be strictly guarded. They are private and confidential even in states with sunshine laws. The general results of the evaluation, however, require different treatment. They need not be made public when the assessment has been informal and conducted in quiet, behind-the-scene fashion. This is one of the advantages of the informal approach. The more formal and public the assessment becomes, on the other hand, the more important it is to publicize the conclusions. These conclusions may include important new directions and objectives for the institution, changes in the structure of governance, reaffirmation of trustee support for the president and recommendations for his or her future direction of effort. Some details may need to be handled in executive session, but a public announcement of the major points will answer legitimate questions and allay suspicions.

It should not need saying, though it apparently needs to be said, that the trustees, or chancellor in a statewide system, must always be open with the president. This is no place for conniving behind his or her back. The president must know that the board intends to conduct an evaluation. The president should be given every opportunity to participate in the planning of the evaluation. The president should get the full brunt of the findings resulting from the evaluation, some of which, as just noted, should be made public and some reserved for private consultation.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

There is no single way, which is right or best, for assessing presidential performance. What works for one institution would be disastrous for another. Differences of type, of complexity, of temper, of governing structure dictate different methods of procedure. Each board must review its own situation, asking what it wants to accomplish by an evaluation, and given their precise set of conditions what procedure will be most effective and productive. One caution applies to all institutions. Avoid as far as possible initiating a review of the president's status and performance as the result of a sudden crisis. Sometimes boards, as we have noted, have little or no choice when storms blow up, but the atmosphere such storms create severely reduces the usefulness of the evaluation.

Although an increasing number of institutions are turning to formal evaluations, their disadvantages must be weighed against their advantages. The many arguments pro and con are to be found throughout this study. Formal assessments are certainly preferable to the casual procedures followed by many boards of trustees, but the continuous monitoring of the president's performance and the institution's progress by knowledgeable and responsible trustees is probably the ideal arrangement. This falls into the category of informal evaluations, but it is a far cry from the inadequate procedures which characterize most such ventures. Where trustees feel inadequate or unprepared for the heavy assignment of continuous assessment, the outside consultant can be immensely helpful. In some situations the consultant becomes an invaluable and confidential counselor to the board or the trustee committee in planning the evaluation. In others the use of a consultant opens up the process which becomes at once both public and formal. The outside consultant, however, as we suggested in Chapter 8, can avoid the worst dangers of a public hearing and trial.

The current trend is in the direction of more formal, which means more elaborate, evaluations. Many presidents, including some who do not look upon formal assessments with favor, believe that they are here to stay. The current trend in postsecondary education is toward their use, but they may in time wear themselves out. Trustees may discover that the time and energy and psychic cost are disproportionate to the advantages. We are unlikely to sink back into the haphazard practices of the past. Trustees are becoming much more knowledgeable about their

institutions and their responsibilities, and the advantages of a consciously planned program of continuous assessment are becoming more obvious.

Since formal evaluations are likely to dominate the thinking of an increasing number of boards in the years immediately ahead, it is important that they be done right. Even evaluations which would be classified as informal can profit from the experience of other institutions. To be done properly presidential assessments should include the following ingredients.

1. A consciously planned design which is clear about the purposes to be achieved and the methods used. Such a plan should be developed in cooperation with the president; it should not be forced on him or her. Presidential assessment is a very human affair. It is dealing with the professional and personal life of the president. The attitude and behavior of the president's spouse and the nature of the presidential household affect the president's performance. They are a part of the picture and provide an additional reason why the assessment needs to be conducted with understanding of and sensitivity to the position in which the president is placed. Ideally the plan should be agreed upon at the time of appointment if not already established by bylaw or precedent.

2. An appraisal of all aspects of governance. The president is only one of the actors, with a central and important role, but a limited one at best. A truly constructive evaluation must include the role of the governing board, the performance of all administrative officers, the prerogatives of the faculty, the rights of students, and, in statewide systems, the authority of the central office. A review of board responsibilities and performance could well precede the evaluation of the president. Neither can be successfully completed without the other. One of the major causes of apprehension on the part of presidents is the fear that their performance will be judged by people who do not really understand the nature of their job. Therefore, it becomes important to make sure that trustees do understand the complexities and limitations of the modern president's position. It is obviously unfair to hold the president responsible for actions or failures to act in situations in which he or she has neither authority nor power.

3. The full participation of the president has already been emphasized, and one important aspect of that participation is a presidential self-assessment. Such a statement of goals conceived and progress toward them plus objectives for the future helps trustees to see the president's task in perspective and can set new goals for the institution. It is a salutary exercise for the president whose daily pressures and commitments often prevent him or her from seeing the academic woods for the managerial trees.

4. Public opinion about the president's performance is relevant, but should be sought under carefully controlled conditions, if at all. Campus rumors and hearsay evidence should be viewed with suspicion. The solicitation of the opinions of faculty, students, alumni and others should be done on a selective, not a broadcast, basis. Anything resembling a popularity poll should be avoided. Interviews are more revealing than questionnaires, well worth the extra time and effort. The use of outside consultant(s), familiar with the educational terrain, is particularly helpful at this stage.

5. Control throughout the assessment process must remain in the hands of the trustees and must be understood by all parties to belong there. Faculty and other constituencies have a role to play in the selection of college and university presidents; mixed committees of search and selection are becoming the standard procedures. Such committees can be useful in soliciting information about an incumbent president, but their function should not extend beyond that and in most instances it is better to focus the gathering of information in a trustee committee. The president has been appointed by the board. He or she serves at the pleasure of the board. The president is responsible to faculty, students, staff and others only in the indirect sense of guiding and managing an enterprise in which they can realize their proper functions. It is to the governing board that the president has direct and primary responsibility.

6. The more formal and public the evaluation, the more important it becomes to give some public account of the board's conclusions. This may be no more than the general statement that the board has reviewed the president's performance after five years in office (or three or four) and feels that the institution is singularly fortunate to have President X at its helm. Or it may be a much more elaborate statement outlining procedures followed, weaknesses as well as strengths found in the governing structure, new objectives for the institution and new assignments for the president. It helps the president and the institution to have the air cleared. Negative findings that would be embarrassing to the president or members of the staff should be dealt with privately, but many criticisms of the president and of the administration as a whole can be publicly stated. After all, no one is perfect, and no president can possibly be all the things and do all the things that are often expected.

7. The ultimate purpose of the evaluation is to help the president and to strengthen the institution. It is therefore preferable to separate the assessment from decisions regarding the reappointment of the president or changes in compensation. Decisions on continuation in office and level of compensation presuppose judgments of competence and review of performance. But the real value of presidential assessment is lost sight of when the process is

closely tied to these practical issues. That purpose is to help the president see where he or she is doing well and where ill, how his or her contribution to the institution's leadership and management can be improved, what goals or new emphases will be important in the next three to five years, and how they can best be achieved. It follows from this that both the president and the governing board need to take action on the recommendations resulting from the assessment. Presidents can change. They can concentrate on new issues and within limits they can change their style of action. And if weaknesses in the governing structure are revealed by the evaluation, the exercise is largely wasted unless steps are taken to improve the structure.

There is a widespread belief that the job of the college or university president has in the past two decades become so complex and difficult that good men and women are no longer willing to serve. Even a casual inspection of the current academic scene indicates that highly qualified and deeply dedicated men and women are serving as presidents. What we do not know is how many others like them might be serving if conditions were different. Trustees would be wise to make the job as attractive as possible and to conserve the investments they have made in selecting present incumbents. The problem is not how to get rid of presidents, but how to keep them and to help them grow. The assessment of presidential performance, in whatever form, is ultimately justifiable only when it achieves this purpose.

OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 • (202) 232-8656

ADDITION TO SPEC KIT 72 EXECUTIVE REVIEW

March 1981

Updated Evaluation Forms

Library Faculty Evaluation* 7 pages

Procedure
Inventory of Professional Service and Growth
Supervisor Evaluation

Director/Library Evaluation 2 pages

Texas A&M University Libraries

*The library reports that the first form is used to evaluate the director and every faculty member annually. The second form is a check-off form used exculsively for the director's annual evaluation by the faculty. Since it is objective, it serves as a tool for comparison with previous evaluations.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

Library Faculty Evaluation

Procedure

1. Preliminary steps:
   a. The individual will fill out the Inventory of Professional Service and Growth and submit it to his/her supervisor.
   b. Review the position description and the Inventory of Professional Service and Growth for the individual.
   c. Consider the individual's strengths and weadnesses.
   d. Consider means for meeting the developmental needs of the individual.

2. Complete the evaluation form and attach it to the individual's Inventory of Professional Service and Growth. Bear in mind that the evaluation is for the entire period (May 1 - April 30), not just a few months.

3. Review the completed forms with the appropriate assistant director of the Director of Libraries.

4. Appraisal interview:
   a. Several days in advance, arrange date, time, and place of interview. Allow adequate time for you and the individual to meet in private.
   b. Begin by discussing some strengths of the individual. Be specific. Use examples.
   c. Inquire about problems or obstacles which affect the individual's job satisfaction and professional development.
   d. Practice "active listening."
   e. Ask the individual for suggestions on how you can help him/her on the job (aspects of your own behavior, attitudes). Seek feedback on how your behavior and attitudes affect his/her job performance.
   f. Discuss only a few major areas in which the individual needs development. Together, set goals, short term objectives for the coming year. Plan for training opportunities, personal growth, development of the individual's strengths.

5. Response:
   The individual being evaluated shall be given ample time in private to read the form and to comment in writing on any aspect of the evaluation. He/she should sign the appraisal form to indicate that he/she has read it.

6. The forms should be hand carried by the supervisor to the appropriate assistant director. The Director of Libraries should meet with each individual to discuss the evaluation.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
Library Faculty Evaluation

Part I: Inventory of Professional Service and Growth

To be completed by the individual being evaluated.

NAME	TITLE AND DEPARTMENT
PERIOD COVERED	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

Discuss your activities since your last evaluation which you feel have contributed to your professional growth. Include such things as job achievement, research projects, publication in librarianship or other scholarly fields of interest, continuing education (course work, advanced degrees, workshops, seminars, etc.), service on University and Library committees, participation in special programs or projects, participation in professional and scholarly organizations, teaching of organized classes (specify percent of budgeted time), and other service to the community, state, or nation.

Attach additional pages if necessary. Once this portion is completed, turn the entire form in to your supervisor.

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
Library Faculty Evaluation

Part II: Supervisor's Evaluation

To be completed by the supervisor after having reviewed the individual's Inventory of Professional Service and Growth.

NAME	TITLE AND DEPARTMENT

DATE OF APPOINTMENT	FACULTY RANK	DATE

SUPERVISOR'S NAME & TITLE	DATE OF EVALUATION	PERIOD COVERED

The purpose of this appraisal is to provide a record of the individual's job performance and to provide systematic planning for the individual's continuing professional growth and development.

1. Summarize the responsibilities of the position and specify the primary tasks performed. Indicate any special tasks assigned during this period. Note: If the person being evaluated has spent part of his/her time teaching organized classes, his/her performance as a classroom teacher is <u>not</u> to be evaluated on this form.

2. How effectively has the person fulfilled the responsibility of this position? Evaluate quality and quantity of work. Describe any special contributions made during the year.

3. Describe the particular strengths of the individual as demonstrated in the position. Consider such factors as organizational ability, initiative, judgment, cooperativeness (with supervisors, subordinates, and the Library's public), adaptability, and supervisory ability.

4. Indicate the areas in which the individual can improve performance. Suggest ways (i.e., formal training, continuing education, changes in job responsibilities and priorities, etc.) in which the individual can develop professionally.

CONFERENCE NOTES: Use this section to list achievable objectives agreed upon during the appraisal interview.

Comments of appropriate assistant director:

DATE

SIGNATURE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

Comments of Director of Libraries:

DATE

APPROVED BY DIRECTOR OF LIBRARIES

I recommend this faculty member for:

Continuation_____ Merit Increase_____ Promotion_____ Termination_____

_____ _____

DATE SIGNATURE OF SUPERVISOR

Comments, if any, by evaluated faculty member.

_____Agree with evaluation

_____Disagree with evaluation

_____ _____

DATE SIGNATURE OF EVALUATED FACULTY MEMBER

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

DIRECTOR/LIBRARY EVAULATION

	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE	NO OPINION	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE
1. My fellow employees regard the Director with respect and confidence.	()	()	()	()	()
2. I know how I stand with the Director.	()	()	()	()	()
3. I am free to talk over questions and problems with the Director.	()	()	()	()	()
4. The Director is looking out for the best interests of the employees.	()	()	()	()	()
5. The Director encourages me to make suggestions for improvement.	()	()	()	()	()
6. The Director offers criticism in a friendly and helpful manner.	()	()	()	()	()
7. The Director praises me when I do a good job.	()	()	()	()	()
8. The Director expects more of me than seems fair.	()	()	()	()	()
9. The Director is interested in helping me do a better job.	()	()	()	()	()
10. I have a clear idea of the quantity and quality of work expected.	()	()	()	()	()
11. People are afraid to say what they think here.	()	()	()	()	()
12. Merit raises are handled equitably within the Library.	()	()	()	()	()
13. I have respect and confidence in the Director.	()	()	()	()	()
14. My job is secure as long as I work well.	()	()	()	()	()
15. The Director doesn't supervise enough.	()	()	()	()	()
16. The Director is easily available and willing to help when questions or problems arise.	()	()	()	()	()

17. The Director is willing to learn about jobs she is not familiar with in order to improve the situation.	()	()	()	()	()
18. The Director enforces matters of discipline in a fair manner.	()	()	()	()	()
19. Personnel problems are handled discreetly by the Director.	()	()	()	()	()
20. The Director has the respect and confidence of members of the University community with whom I am acquainted.	()	()	()	()	()
21. The Director values and acts upon feedback from the staff and patrons, regarding Library operations.	()	()	()	()	()
22. The Director is service oriented.	()	()	()	()	()
23. The Director is a good arbitrator.	()	()	()	()	()
24. The Director has a clear idea of the Library's role in the University's mission.	()	()	()	()	()
25. The Director conducts the affairs of the library in a free and open manner.	()	()	()	()	()